Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108057

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108057
Time of filing	2025-10-30 09:44:46
Domain names	1xbet.cafe, 1xbet.vodka, 1xbet.press

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	DIDIANE LTD

Respondent

Organization	megashart.com

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complaint is submitted in the name of DIDIANE LTD, the owner of various 1XBET – international trademark registrations, some of which are listed below:

- Registration Number: 1817326A (word), Registration Date: September 3, 2024;
- Registration Number: 1673113A (figurative), Registration Date: May 2, 2022;
- Registration Number: 1673396A (figurative), Registration Date: May 2, 2022;
- Registration Number: 1673116A (figurative), Registration Date: May 2, 2022;
- Registration Number: 1673114A (figurative), Registration Date: May 2, 2022;
- Registration Number: 1672896A (figurative), Registration Date: April 6, 2022;
- Registration Number: 1669925A (figurative), Registration Date: April 6, 2022;
- Registration Number: 1379235 (figurative), Registration Date: July 21, 2017.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the owner of the “1XBET” trademarks and belongs to the group of companies operating under the brand name “1xBET”, which is an online gaming platform with worldwide reach (hereinafter also referred to as "1xBET"). 1xBET was founded in 2007 and the Complainant has existed since 9 March 2015. 1xBet offers sports betting, lottery, bingo, live betting, lottery, etc. 1xBet is licensed by the government of Curacao. Furthermore, 1xBet promotes responsible gambling on its website.

1xBET has become one of the world's leading betting companies. This is proven by multiple prestigious awards and prizes the company has won and been nominated for, namely at the SBC Awards, Global Gaming Awards, and International Gaming Awards. 1xBet Betting Company is an active sponsor of the top football tournaments – official presenting partner of Italy´s Serie A, media´s partner of Spain´s La Liga, and is the sponsor of the of number of big international tournaments such as the Africa Cup of Nations.

1xBET 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. For example, in July 2019, FC Barcelona announced that it had

signed a partnership with 1xBet, naming the company as the team's new global partner.

In 2019, 1xBET became the FC Liverpool´s official global betting partner.

During May 2022, esports organisation OG Esports announced that the company had signed a sponsorship deal with 1xBet. The agreement names 1xBet as OG's official betting sponsor.

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

The disputed domain names were registered on 25 August 2025. On 15 October 2025, the Complaint was filed. The facts asserted in the Complaint are not contested by the Respondent because no Response was filed.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

THE COMPLAINANT

The Complainant is the owner of the “1XBET” trademarks and belongs to the group of companies operating under the brand name “1xBET”, which is an online gaming platform with worldwide reach (hereinafter also referred to as "1xBET"). 1xBET was founded in 2007 and the Complainant has existed since 19 April, 2024. 1xBet offers sports betting, lottery, bingo, live betting, lottery, etc. 1xBet is licensed by the government of Curacao. Furthermore, 1xBet promotes responsible gambling on its website.

1xBET has become one of the world's leading betting companies. This is proven by multiple prestigious awards and prizes the company has won and been nominated for, namely at the SBC Awards, Global Gaming Awards, International Gaming Awards, Best Sportsbook Operator, Mobile Sports Product of the Year, and Best Crypto Operator at the SiGMA Awards.

1xBET has developed a strong presence and reputation in the global online gambling market, and operates a website under the domain name: <1xbet.com>, which includes Complainant's “1XBET” trademark. 1xBET uses this domain name to resolve to its online betting websites.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names.

RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant response was filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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

Paragraph 15 of the Rules states that the Panel shall decide a Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

In the case of default by a Party, Rule 14 states that if a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under the Rules, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as appropriate.

In the present case, the Respondent has not submitted any Response and consequently has not contested any of the contentions made by the Complainant.

The Panel proceeds therefore to decide only on the basis of the Complainant's factual statements and the documentary evidences provided in support of them.

(A) THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

The first element requires showing that the Complainant holds trademark rights in a mark that is identical or confusingly similar to the disputed domain names.

The Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of its registered trademark rights in the marks 1XBET across various jurisdictions, including Turkey, the Respondent's country of origin. These registered rights were established well before the Respondent registered the disputed domain names <1xbet.cafe>, <1xbet.vodka>, <1xbet.press>. It is well settled that ownership of a registered trademarks constitutes sufficient rights for the purposes of standing to file a UDRP complaint.

The disputed domain names <1xbet.cafe>, <1xbet.vodka>, <1xbet.press> incorporate the Complainant's 1XBET trademark in its entirety as the dominant element and merely adding the descriptive components .cafe, .vodka and .pess, as the top-level domains, does not eliminate confusing similarity. The Panel finds that the Complainant's marks remain clearly recognisable within the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, it is well established UDRP principles that the top-level domain (".com") is disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

The Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks.

(B) THE RESPONDENT'S RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Under the second element, the Complainant must establish that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. UDRP panels generally accept that once a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the respondent; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1.

Here, the Complainant has stated that:

- the Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain names, nor is the Respondent affiliated to the Complainant in any form;

- there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by any of the dispute domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks; and

- the Respondent has not been using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the structure of the disputed domain names – incorporating in its second first portion the "1XBET" trademark, 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' mind.

By reading the disputed domain names, incorporating the "1XBET" trademark, Internet users may be falsely led to believe that the disputed domain name is directly connected to, authorized by or endorsed by the Complainant. However, it is not the case. The disputed domain names have not been authorized or approved by the Complainant.

For the foregoing reasons, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, within the meaning of the Paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and (4)(c) of the Policy. As the Respondent has not submitted any response, the Complainant's prima facie case stands unrebutted. The Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names under paragraph 4(a)(ii).

(C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE

The third element requires the Complainant to show that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii).

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy lists non-exhaustive circumstances indicative of bad faith, including where the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks.

The Complainant's "1XBET" trademark are distinctive and well established in connection with the Complainant's online gambling business. Given their long-standing use and international reputation, it is more likely than not that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its marks at the time of registration.

The disputed domain names <1xbet.cafe>, <1xbet.vodka>, <1xbet.press> strongly suggest intentional targeting of the Complainant. Such deliberate use of the Complainant's trademark components inside of the disputed domain names is a recognised indicator of bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent's use of the domain names – designed to evoke the Complainant's marks and divert traffic to competing or misleading content – constitutes conduct falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv): intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to affiliation, sponsorship, or endorsement.

Furthermore, such conduct disrupts the Complainant's business, which supports a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iii) and (v).

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith under 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. **1xbet.cafe**: Transferred
2. **1xbet.vodka**: Transferred
3. **1xbet.press**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Hana Číslerová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-12-05

Publish the Decision