

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108025

Case number CAC-UDRP-108025

Time of filing 2025-10-14 10:37:02

Domain names lxbet.africa

Case administrator

Name Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization DIDIANE LTD

Respondent

Organization PariPesa Group

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has submitted evidence that it is the owner of several international trademarks, registered with WIPO, valid in various jurisdictions including African countries, consisting of or including the term "1XBET", including:

- Word trademark: 1XBET: Registration Number: 1817326A, Registration Date: September 3, 2024, classes 35, 41, 42 (protection granted in various African countries, but awaiting decision for Kenya);
- Figurative trademark: 1XBET: Registration Number: 1673113A, Registration Date: May 2, 2022, classes 35, 41, 42 (protection granted in various African countries, including Kenya);
- Figurative trademark: 1XBET: Registration Number: 1673396A, Registration Date: May 2, 2022, classes 35, 41, 42 (protection granted in various African countries, including Kenya);
- Figurative trademark: 1XBET: Registration Number: 1673116A, Registration Date: May 2, 2022, classes 35, 41, 42 (protection granted in various African countries, including Kenya);
- Figurative trademark: 1XBET: Registration Number: 1673114A, Registration Date: May 2, 2022, classes 35, 41, 42 (protection granted in various African countries, including Kenya);
- Figurative trademark: 1XBET: Registration Number: 1672896A, Registration Date: April 6, 2022, classes 41, 42 (protection granted in various African countries, including Kenya);
- Figurative trademark: 1XBET: Registration Number: 1669925A, Registration Date: April 6, 2022, classes 41, 42 (protection granted in various African countries, including Kenya);
- Figurative trademark: 1XBET: Registration Number: 1379235, Registration Date: July 21, 2017, classes 35, 41, 42 (protection granted in various African countries).

These trademarks are hereafter referred to as the "1XBET Trademarks."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Facts asserted by the Complainant:

The Complainant forms part of the international 1XBET group of companies, active in online betting and gaming. It asserts that the

1XBET Trademarks are well known in Africa and used extensively in commerce. Rights in the relevant trademark registrations were transferred to the Complainant after its incorporation in 2024.

The disputed domain name <lxbet.africa> was registered on 26 September 2024. The registrant's identity is partially obscured, with only "New Zealand" stated as the country of residence, although the Respondent is in fact located in Kenya.

The Complainant attempted to obtain suspension of the domain name and disclosure of registrant details through several requests to the Registrar in September and October 2025, but received no response.

Accessing the domain name displays only the message "Access to this page is restricted."

Facts asserted by the Respondent:

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name was registered exclusively for the development of an independent project under the brand "LXBET" and that preparations were made for securing trademark protection. The project has since been abandoned, and the domain is "no longer required for any business purpose". No content referencing the Complainant, its branding, or its services has been published on the website linked to the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not intend to imitate the Complainant nor benefit from its goodwill. The term "LXBET" is not a variation of "1XBET".

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant's contentions:

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its 1XBET Trademarks. The dominant element "XBET" is reproduced in full. The substitution of the digit "1" with the visually similar lowercase "l" constitutes typosquatting.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not authorised, licensed or affiliated with the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by "LXBET" or holds any rights in that name. The Respondent has provided no proof of bona fide preparations to use the domain name. The passive state of the domain name and the absence of genuine preparations demonstrate lack of legitimate interests.

The Complainant claims bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent must have known of the longstanding 1XBET Trademarks. The similarity between "lxbet" and "1xbet" indicates intentional targeting. Post-Complaint trademark filings for "LXBET" reinforce an attempt to retrospectively manufacture legitimacy.

The Respondent's contentions:

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name is not identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. "LXBET" is an original brand name coined independently by the Respondent. The prefix "LX" creates a distinct commercial impression and is not a variation of "1XBET".

The Respondent registered the domain name as part of preparations for an independent business project called "LXBET". Preparatory steps for trademark protection allegedly support a legitimate interest. The later abandonment of the project should not negate legitimate interests that existed at the time of registration. No attempt was made to imitate or refer to the Complainant.

The Respondent denies targeting the Complainant and does not oppose a transfer, but maintains that the record does not support a finding of bad-faith registration or use. The domain name was not registered to sell it, disrupt the Complainant's business, or exploit its goodwill. No misleading content was ever published through the disputed domain name. The passive state of the domain reflects abandonment of the Respondent's internal project, not bad faith.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

On November 19, 2025, the Complainant filed a reply to the Respondent's Response. While the acceptance of unsolicited supplemental submissions lies within the Panel's discretion, the Panel determines to accept the Complainant's supplemental statement which mainly emphasises the lack of evidence by the Respondent and the fact that various trademarks "LXBET" have been applied for after the start of the current proceeding (see below).

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1. Confusing Similarity

The disputed domain name <lxbet.africa> consists of the term "LXBET" and the gTLD ".africa".

The gTLD ".africa" is disregarded when assessing similarity under the first element.

The Panel finds that "LXBET" is confusingly similar to "1XBET."

Although the string "lxbet" differs by the substitution of the digit "1" with the letter "l", both characters are visually similar, particularly in lowercase, and the sequence XBET, which forms the dominant and distinctive element of the Complainant's trademarks, is reproduced in its entirety.

UDRP panels have consistently held that minor character substitution, particularly between visually similar letters and numerals, constitutes typosquatting and supports a finding of confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent.

The Respondent claims to have registered the disputed domain name for an independent "LXBET" project and to have taken preparatory steps, including plans to seek trademark protection. However, the Respondent provides no documentary evidence of: business plans, website development, branding or marketing materials, contracts or correspondence, trademark filings predating the Complaint, or other relevant factors.

The Panel finds as follows:

- The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the term "LXBET" (or "1XBET").
- There is no evidence that the Respondent holds any registered or unregistered rights (such as a trademark or trade name) incorporating "LXBET".
- The Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise authorised by the Complainant to use the 1XBET Trademark or to register confusingly similar terms in a domain name.
- There is no evidence that the Respondent has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.
- The disputed domain name is not being used for an active website, and there is no evidence of any legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Therefore, on the balance of probabilities and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. The Panel concludes that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

3. Registration and Use in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that, on balance, the cumulative circumstances support a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- All of the Complainant's 1XBET Trademarks have been registered well before the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The earliest 1XBET Trademark of the Complainant dates from 2017. The most recent 1XBET Trademark of the

- Complainant (i.e., the word trademark) dates from shortly before the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.
- All of the Complai
-