

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SB Advanced Systems Ltd., v. MARIA-LUISA JAKOVLEVA
Case No. DRO2026-0009

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SB Advanced Systems Ltd., Cyprus, represented by Cabinet de Avocat Maravela Mihaela, Romania.

The Respondent is MARIA-LUISA JAKOVLEVA, Estonia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <superbetromania.ro> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered via ROTLD (the “Registry”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 30, 2026. On May 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 5, 2026, the Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Private Individual, GDPR Protected) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 6, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .RO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”) the Rules for .RO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .RO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriela Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on June 18, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is part of the Superbet Group in the sport gambling industry. The Superbet Group was founded in 2008 in Romania and has businesses in the retail market of sport gambling in Romania. The Complainant's group also offers a mobile application with a wide range of products in the field of online betting, slot games, live casino, virtual games and lotteries.

The Complainant holds various trademarks for the SUPERBET mark. The relevant trademark registrations include, inter alia, the Romanian Trademark Registration No. 178023 for “ **SUPERBET** ” in Classes 9, 16, 28, 35, 41, 42 registered on January 3, 2022, and the European Union Trademark Registration No. 018492483 for “ **SUPERBET** ” in Classes 7, 9, 16, 35, 41, 42 registered on April 25, 2023 (the “Complainant's Trademark”).

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on January 12, 2026, a few years after the Complainant registered the Complainant's Trademark. At the time of filing of the Complaint and the rendering of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an active website that displays the Complainant's Trademark and promotes an online betting business. It also contains click-through links which resolve to webpages of third-party online betting websites (the “Respondent's Website”).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(a) The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark. The Disputed Domain Name consists of the Complainant's Trademark with the addition of the country name “Romania”. The Complainant's Trademark is immediately recognizable in the Disputed Domain Name, and that the addition of the country name “Romania” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The addition of the “.ro” may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity, as it is a technical requirement of registration.

(b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of the Complainant's Trademark in a domain name or otherwise. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website impersonating the Complainant, displaying its trademark and logo as well as its favicon, and purporting to offer gambling services, which is the Complainant's area of activity. The Respondent's Website redirects to commercial third-party online casinos asking for personal data for registration. Therefore, the website at the Disputed Domain Name was designed to mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

(c) The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name and is using it in bad faith. Given the reputation of the Complainant's Trademark and its businesses, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and the Complainant's Trademark at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name and that the Respondent is opportunistically using the goodwill of the Complainant's Trademark in order to

attract Internet users to the Respondent's Website. The Disputed Domain Name is used by the Respondent to impersonate the Complainant and to redirect Internet users to the websites of the competitors of the Complainant, which shows a clear attempt to generate a commercial gain by misleading online users.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a (i) trademark or service mark or (ii) with a geographical indication protected in Romania or by European Union law in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered or is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's Trademark and the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7. ¹

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's Trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the country code Top-Level Domain in this case ".ro" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the first element.

Although the addition of other term (here, "romania") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a Disputed Domain Name.

Although the overall burden of proof in .RO proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of

¹Noting the similarities between the .RO Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), the Panel will consider the UDRP, as well as the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and UDRP decisions.

proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the Respondent did not submit a Response. The fact that the Respondent did not submit a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. However, the Respondent's failure to file a Response may result in the Panel drawing appropriate inferences from such default. The Panel may also accept all reasonable and supported allegations and inferences flowing from the Complainant as true (see *Entertainment Shopping AG v. Nischal Soni, Sonik Technologies*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1437](#); and *Charles Jourdan Holding AG v. AAIM*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0403](#)).

The Panel notes that there is no evidence on the available record to show that the Respondent has trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name, or that the Respondent has become commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel further notes that the Complainant has provided no license or authorization of any kind to the Respondent to use the Complainant's Trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's Trademark. The Respondent would likely not have adopted the Complainant's Trademark if not for the purpose of creating an impression that the Disputed Domain Name is associated with or originates from the Complainant. The reproduction of the Complainant's Trademark, with the additional term "romania" (which is the country that the Complainant operates in) in the Disputed Domain Name, as well as the use of the Complainant's Trademark on the Respondent's Website also lead to a risk of implied affiliation as the Disputed Domain Name effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name is in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or should be regarded as legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent used the Respondent's Website to impersonate or pass itself off as the Complainant by featuring the Complainant's Trademark and advertising an online betting business similar to that of the Complainant. The Respondent's Website attempts to divert business away from the Complainant while capitalizing on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's Trademark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that it is difficult to conceive of any plausible use of the Disputed Domain Name by the unaffiliated Respondent that would amount to good faith use, given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety, and that the Respondent's Website displays the Complainant's Trademark and contains website links that redirect Internet users to third-party websites promoting businesses that are similar to or competing with that of the Complainant. The Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name to mislead and divert Internet users to the Respondent's Website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's

Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website. Further, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's contentions and has provided no evidence of its actual or contemplated good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's business and the Complainant's Trademark when registering and using the Disputed Domain Name given the various trademark registrations of the Complainant's Trademark that predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name, and the fact that the Respondent's Website features the Complainant's Trademark and promotes an online betting business similar to that of the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name <superbetromania.ro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gabriela Kennedy/

Gabriela Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: July 2, 2026