Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107972

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107972
Time of filing	2025-09-18 15:24:27
Domain names	1xbetin.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	MOKVEZA LTD

Complainant representative

Organization	Sindelka & Lachmannová advokáti s.r.o.

Respondent

Name	Rostyslav Karyi

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 is the owner of:

European Union trademark for 1XBET (word) registration No. 014227681 registered on September 21, 2015;

European Union trademark (device) registration no. 017517327 registered on March 7, 2018; and

European Union trademark for 1XBET (device) 017517384 registered on March 7, 2018.

All the above listed trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant is the owner of the 1XBET trademark and belongs to the group of companies operating under the brand name 1xBET, which is an online gaming platform with worldwide reach. The Complainant was founded in 2007, and offers sports betting, lotteries, bingo, live betting etc. The Complainant is licensed by the government of Curacao.

The Complainant has become one of the world's leading betting companies.

The Complainant has developed a strong presence and reputation in the global online gambling market, as evidenced by the numerous sponsorship agreements signed with top sports organizations.

The Complainant also operates a website under the domain name <1xbet.com>, which includes the Complainant's 1XBET trademark. The Complainant uses this domain name to resolve to its online betting websites.

Previous panelists in other UDRP procedures have recognized the 1XBET trademark as a renowned trademark.

According to the registry's verification, the registrant is based in Kyiv, Ukraine.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 29, 2024.

Currently the disputed domain name is not active. However, from the submission provided by the Complainant it appears that the disputed domain name previously (at least on September 17, 2025) resolved to a website prominently featuring the 1XBET trademark and stylized logo together with the message "Official Site 1xBet India – Sport Betting and Casino".

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

Legal grounds:

1) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name <1xbetin.com> wholly incorporates the Complainant's registered and widely known 1XBET trademark. The addition of the country abbreviation "in" (referring to India) does not dispel the confusing similarity with the trademark under the first element.

The inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".com" is a standard technical requirement and may be disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 29, 2024, i.e. many years after the registration of the Complainant's 1XBET trademark.
The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent affiliated to the Complainant in any way.
There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks.
The Respondent has not been using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.
The structure of the disputed domain name – incorporating the 1XBET trademark and the abbreviation referring to the name of the country "IN" – reflects the Respondent's intention to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, with the Complainant, its 1XBET trademarks, and its business conducted under the same, in Internet users' minds.
The website associated with the disputed domain name (showing the sign "Official Site 1xBet India – Sport Betting and Casino") is crafted to give users the false impression of an official connection with the Complainant and its 1XBET trademarks.
Previous panels have categorically ruled that the use of a domain name for illegal activities such as impersonation and other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

3) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the first registrations of the Complainant's renowned 1XBET trademark. Moreover, 1xBET has an overwhelming online presence in the gambling and betting sectors.
Furthermore, the structure of the disputed domain name shows that the Respondent registered it with the Complainant and its trademarks in mind.
Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to an infringing website repeatedly quoting the Complainant's 1XBET trademarks. This further shows that, at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent acquired it with the very likely intent to use it in connection with the 1XBET trademarks.
Finally, online searches indicate that a person with the Respondent's name was also the respondent in Chewy Inc. v. Rostislav Karyi / Ростислав Карый, WIPO Case No. DUA2020-007, another UDRP dispute concerning the domain name <chewy.com.ua>, in which a transfer was ordered.
In view of the above facts, it is clear that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.
The disputed domain name <1xbetin.com> incorporates the Complainant's widely known 1XBET trademark in its entirety, combined with the geographical term "in" for India. This combination is clearly intended to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is an official or authorized local platform of the Complainant in India. This point is further supported by a statement appearing on the website "Official Site 1xBet India". The use of the Complainant's trademark in the domain name, together with the country reference, is designed to divert traffic by exploiting user trust in the 1XBET brand, particularly among users seeking localized

betting services. This creates a clear likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website. Internet users encountering the domain are likely to assume they are dealing with an official Indian portal of the Complainant, and may attempt to register or deposit funds based on this assumption.

The Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name therefore appear to be a deliberate attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by capitalizing on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark.

RESPONDENT:
No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

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.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A) Confusing similarity
The disputed domain name contains the Complainant’s registered trademark 1XBET in its entirety with the addition of the term “in”. This Panel agrees with the Complainant's and previous Panels' view, that the addition of a generic term associated to a trademark does not create a new or different right to the mark or diminish confusing similarity.

B) Lack of legitimate rights or interests

The disputed domain name is a distinctive, non-descriptive name. It is unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without having the Complainant firmly in mind. The Respondent does not appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In fact, it appears that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for an unauthorised website displaying the Complainant’s trademark and offering services in direct competition with those offered by the Complainant. The Panel thus notes that the composition and use of the disputed domain name create a likelihood of confusion as to the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant (where there is none). The Complainant’s assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie demonstration of absence of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The burden of evidence therefore shifts to the Respondent to show, using tangible evidence, that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.
C) Registered and Used in Bad Faith
The Complainant gives sound bases for its contention that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.
Firstly, owing to the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website offering services in direct competition with those offered by the Complainant under the name “1xbet in”, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark, and so the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademarks when registering the

disputed domain name.
Secondly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's unchallenged assertion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the aim of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. In fact, the disputed domain name appears to have been used to attract internet users and offer possibly fraudulent services while impersonating the Complainant or, at a minimum, to offer services in direct competition with those offered by the Complainant.
Finally, the Respondent has not responded to nor denied any of the assertions made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **1xbetin.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Fabrizio Bedarida**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-31

Publish the Decision