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 Slanařová (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 Complainant's 1XBET Trademarks cover African jurisdictions, and almost all of them cover the country of Kenya, where the Respondent is based.
- In the WhoIs database, the Respondent has entered that it is based in New Zealand, whereas in fact the Respondent is based in Kenya. Providing false contact details is an element indicating bad faith.
- The Respondent, in addressing the Complainant's well-supported Complaint, offers only broad and unsubstantiated assertions regarding preparations for an alleged "LXBET" project, certain trademark applications, and the supposed later abandonment of that project. However, the Respondent provides no explanation, argumentation, or documentary evidence to support any aspect of these claims - whether relating to the existence of the project, the filing or status of any trademark applications, or the reasons and circumstances surrounding the project's abandonment. Nor does the Respondent explain why it selected the name "LXBET", particularly in light of the Complainant's arguments that the 1XBET Trademarks are well known in Africa and that the substitution of the digit "1" with the visually similar letter "l" (especially in lowercase) is indicative of typosquatting.
- The disputed domain name is passively held. The Complainant has argued that its 1XBET Trademarks have a strong reputation and are widely known (which seems to be confirmed by decisions in other domain name disputes based on the 1XBET Trademarks, and which is not disputed by the Respondent). The Respondent has not provided evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has taken active steps to conceal its identity. The Respondent has used false contact details for the domain registration. In light of these factors, it is not possible to conceive of a plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate.

The Panel believes from the facts in this case that the Respondent had the Trademarks of the Complainant in mind when registering and using the disputed domain name.

In its additional submission, the Complainant states that, notwithstanding the Respondent's statement that it has abandoned its "LXBET" project, several "LXBET" trademark applications have been filed after the initiation of the Complaint. The relevant chronology can be summarised as follows:

- 23 September, 26 September, 6 October 2025: The Complainant sends various emails to the Respondent's registrar but does not receive any response.
- 7 October 2025: The Complainant files its initial complaint.
- 15 October 2025: Filing of trademark application AP/M/2025/007671 for a figurative trademark "LXBET", with ARIPO and with URSB Uganda (classes 41 and 42).
- 17 October 2025: Filing of trademark applications ZM/T/2025/002093 and ZM/T/2025/002094 for a figurative trademark "LXBET", with PACRA Zambia (resp. classes 9 and 16).
- 21 October 2025: The Complainant files its amended complaint.
- 22 October 2025: The CAC Arbitration Centre notifies the complaint to the Respondent.
- 24 October 2025: Filing of trademark application 019266134 for a figurative trademark "LXBET", with EUIPO (classes 41 and 42).

While panels have frequently viewed post-Complaint trademark filings as attempts to manufacture legitimacy retrospectively, the Panel notes that these new trademarks were applied for in the name of a company Belaronda Limited, with an address at Intershore Chambers, P.O. Box 4342, Road Town Tortola, British Virgin Islands. The Panel has no information or documentation about a link between this trademark applicant and the Respondent and thus will not take these new trademark applications into consideration.

For all the reasons stated above, the Panel concludes that the Complainant did prove that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **lxbet.africa**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Bart Van Besien**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-12-04

Publish the Decision