

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bracelet IP Limited v. Henry Tran
Case No. DTV2026-0001

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bracelet IP Limited, Ireland, represented by Markmonitor, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Henry Tran, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wsop.tv> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 6, 2026. On January 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 7, 2026, the Registrar 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 8, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 13, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 January 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 5, 2026. The Respondent requested on January 20, 2026, an additional four calendar days in which to respond to the Complaint, and the Center automatically granted, on January 21, 2026, the extension in accordance with paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, the new Response due date being February 9, 2026. The Respondent requested on January 21, 2026, a further extension of the

Response due date under paragraph 5(e) of the Rules. The Center invited the Complainant on January 22, 2026, to submit any comments on the Respondent's extension request. On January 23, 2026, the Complainant objected to the Respondent's request for an additional extension of the deadline to file the Response. On January 29, 2026, the Center in accordance with paragraph 5(e) of the Rules granted to the Respondent an extension of time to file its Response until February 16, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres, Alistair Payne, and Douglas M. Isenberg as panelists in this matter on March 13, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 the owner and operator of a poker tournament called the WORLD SERIES OF POKER, which has been operating since the 1970s. Since at least 2003, the tournament has also been referred to by its acronym, WSOP. The Complainant's WSOP mark has been recognized by prior panels under the Policy as being globally reputed. See *Harrah's License Company, LLC v. FHC Entertainment*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0989](#).

The Complainant's WSOP mark is registered in multiple jurisdictions, including in the Respondent's country of the United States under Reg. No. 3,499,087 for WSOP in class 41, having a registration date of September 9, 2008, and a use in commerce date of April 15, 2003.

The Complainant's primary website is hosted at its domain name <wsop.com>, which was registered on May 7, 2003.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 23, 2020, and currently¹ resolves to a website titled "WeStreamOnlyPremium.TV" followed by "E-Sports community, join us for upcoming live events hosted by WeStreamOnlyPremium! VALORANT, CS2, League Of Legends". The Complainant's evidence establishes that, as of November 25, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a Registrar parking page offering the disputed domain name for sale for USD 10,000,000, and, as of December 24, 2025, resolved to a website titled "SearchHounds" featuring information on boxing streaming services as well as related searches.

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, due to the global fame of its mark, the disputed domain was registered and has been used in bad faith for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant or its competitors for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

¹ The website associated with the disputed domain name as described herein was viewed by the Panel when this Decision was drafted. As set forth in section 4.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), "a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision,... includ[ing] visiting the website linked to the disputed domain name in order to obtain more information about the respondent or its use of the domain name...".

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not established the elements required under paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(a)(iii) of the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that, prior to any notice of this dispute, he undertook demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate digital streaming project under the name “WeStreamOnlyPremium”, and that the second-level portion of the disputed domain name was chosen as the acronym of this name.

The Respondent requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking on the basis that the Complainant is represented by counsel who advanced allegedly speculative arguments based on conjecture.

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests, and Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In light of the clear indicia of bad faith discussed below, the Panel finds it convenient to address the second and third elements together. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.15.

The earliest evidence of the Respondent’s purported “WeStreamOnlyPremium” project in the record is the Respondent’s screenshot of its user dashboard on the Registrar’s platform, showing that the Respondent published a website titled “WeStreamOnlyPremium” at “westreamonlypremium.godaddysites.com” as of December 12, 2025, which had had 73 site visitors in total and two within the previous 30 days. This screenshot does not show any use of the acronym WSOP that the Respondent claims was the reason for registering the disputed domain name. It also does not show any use of the disputed domain name itself and instead shows use of a subdomain of <godaddysites.com>. In any event, the Respondent has not explained the long delay between registration of the disputed domain name in 2020 and this purported use in 2025.

The Respondent has been somewhat coy about the details of his purported “WeStreamOnlyPremium” business. The Respondent’s website provides very few details, and the “Watch Live Now” button does not function. If the Respondent had indeed made preparations to use the disputed domain name as he claims, then there would at least be some further evidence that the Respondent could easily provide, such as a business plan, proposed content, marketing material, etc.

The Respondent’s choice of name – “WeStreamOnlyPremium” – appears contrived and has the character of having been engineered after the fact.

In the circumstances, the Respondent's purported "WeStreamOnlyPremium" project appears intended to create a pretext for registration of the disputed domain name. See, for e.g., *National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws v. Industry Internet, LLC and Anthony Disano*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0938](#) ("there is no evidence that Respondents used the Contested Domain Name for any purpose other than a pretext, and a pretext concocted only after registering the Contested Domain Name").

The Complainant's WSOP mark is overwhelmingly associated with the Complainant on the Internet. The Complainant's mark was particularly well-known in the Complainant's home jurisdiction of the United States, where the Respondent resides, prior to registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent apparently has familiarity with the E-Sport and streaming industries, which are similar and related to the Complainant's industry whereby its poker tournament is streamed online. It is therefore likely that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's mark; alternatively, the Respondent should have known of it. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Respondent listed the disputed domain name for sale for USD 10 million prior to using it for the "WeStreamOnlyPremium" site. This contradicts the Respondent's claimed purpose for the disputed domain, and the Respondent has provided no cogent explanation for listing the disputed domain name for sale, and for a considerable price.

The Panel accepts that a high asking price does not, in and of itself, suggest targeting, and that legitimate registrants can set whatever asking price they like for their domain names. However, in the particular circumstances of this case, the Panel considers that the asking price likely filters out buyers who are interested in any significance of "wsop" that is not associated with the Complainant and its WSOP trademark, and the Panel infers that the price was knowingly set to limit the set of potential purchasers to the Complainant or those associated with it. *All Star C.V., Converse, Inc. v. Narendra Ghimire*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2024-0014](#). This is bolstered by the fact that the second-level portion of the disputed domain name is overwhelmingly associated with the Complainant on the Internet, and there is a limited number of uses that could legitimately be made of the disputed domain name without the risk of encroaching upon the Complainant's trademark rights. *Puma SE v. Kiril Vaitsekhovich*, WIPO Case No. [DAE2021-0011](#).

On balance of probabilities, the Panel considers that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant or its competitors for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second and third elements of the Policy have 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 disputed domain name <wsop.tv> be transferred to the Complainant. As a result of this order and the findings above, the Panel declines to issue a finding of reverse domain name hijacking.

/Jeremy Speres/
Jeremy Speres
Presiding Panelist

/Alistair Payne/
Alistair Payne
Panelist

/Douglas M. Isenberg/
Douglas M. Isenberg
Panelist
Date: March 19, 2026