

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DIDIANE LTD, MOKVEZA LTD v. Vasily Sarychev

Case No. DSN2026-0001

1. The Parties

The Complainants are DIDIANE LTD, Cyprus (the “First Complainant”) and MOKVEZA LTD, Cyprus (the “Second Complainant”) (jointly referred to as the “Complainant”), represented by Šindelka & Lachmannová advokáti s.r.o., Czech Republic.

The Respondent is Vasily Sarychev, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <xbet.sn> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NETIM (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 25, 2026. On May 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 2026, requesting clarification regarding the domain name identified in the remedy section of the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 18, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform 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 June 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on July 19, 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 a part of the 1xBET group of companies. This group operates an online gaming and betting platform under the 1xBET brand, which was established in 2007 and offers, among other services, sports betting, live betting, lotteries, and bingo.

The First Complainant and the Second Complainant own numerous trademark registrations for 1XBET. The First Complainant is the owner of, inter alia, the following 1XBET trademark registrations:

- the International Trademark Registration for 1XBET (word trademark) No. 1817326A, registered on September 3, 2024; and
- the International Trademark Registration for 1XBET (figurative trademark) No. 1672896A, registered on April 6, 2022.

The Second Complainant is the owner of, inter alia, the following 1XBET trademark registrations:

- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for 1XBET (word trademark) No. 14227681, registered on September 21, 2015; and
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for 1XBET (figurative trademark) No. 017517327, registered on March 7, 2018.

The Complainant states that it also operates a website under the domain name <1xbet.com>, which incorporates its 1XBET trademark and resolves to the Complainant's online gaming and betting platform.

The Domain Name was registered on November 7, 2020.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a website offering information about and promoting online sports betting service in Senegal (the "First Website"). The First Website prominently displayed the Complainant's 1XBET trademark and "xBet" designation, as well as provided links to download the xBet mobile application, together with information regarding registration, betting services, promotional bonuses, deposits and withdrawals, and other features associated with an online betting platform.

As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name redirects to a French-language website prominently displaying the 1XBET trademark and promoting the download of the "1xBet" mobile application, together with information concerning its features and access to the associated online betting services (the "Second 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 Domain Name.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence"; some panels have also expressed this as an "on balance" standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel's satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. See section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

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. This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Although each case is judged on its own merits, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

In the present case, the Complainant holds valid registration for the 1XBET trademark. The Domain Name includes the textual element "xbet" of the Complainant's 1XBET trademark, omitting only the initial numeral "1". Such omission does not prevent the trademark from remaining readily recognizable in the Domain Name. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".sn" in the Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Thus, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the notice of the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

In the present case, the Complainant's 1XBET trademark registrations predate the Respondent's registration of the Domain Name. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the 1XBET trademark or to register the Domain Name incorporating this trademark.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to the First Website, which prominently displayed the Complainant's 1XBET trademark and the "xBet" designation, promoted an online sports betting service in Senegal, and provided links to download mobile applications, together with information concerning other features associated with an online betting platform. As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name redirects to the Second Website, which continues to prominently display the Complainant's 1XBET trademark and promotes the download of the "1xBet" mobile application, together with information concerning the application's features and access to the associated online betting services, thereby creating an apparent association with the Complainant. Such use does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Given the above, there are no circumstances in evidence which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. In sum, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided it is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Complainant's rights in the 1XBET trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. This finding is supported by the use of the Domain Name in connection with the First Website and the Second Website, both of which prominently displayed the Complainant's 1XBET trademark and promoted online betting services associated with that trademark.

Moreover, it has been proven to the Panel's satisfaction that the Complainant's 1XBET trademark is well known and unique to the Complainant, at least in the online betting and gambling industry. Thus, the Respondent could not reasonably ignore the reputation of this trademark, while offering 1XBET-related services and displaying the Complainant's 1XBET trademark. In sum, the Respondent, more likely than not, registered the Domain Name with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's 1XBET trademark.

The Panel thus finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent to attract Internet users to the associated websites. The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of these websites.

For the reasons discussed above, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Name <xbet.sn> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026