Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108127

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108127
Time of filing	2025-12-08 09:34:30
Domain names	oddportals.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Livesport s.r.o.

Respondent

Organization	Adsetweb,LLC

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 the
- EU trademark registration OddsPortal No 6860134, registered on January 12, 2009
- UK trademark registration OddsPortal No UK00906860134, registered on January 12, 2009.

The disputed domain name <oddportals.com> was registered on December 18, 2024.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, owner of the “OddsPortal” trademark and the domain <oddsportal.com>, alleges that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <oddportals.com> in a manner that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to create email addresses for fraudulent communications, impersonating Livesport employees and targeting the Complainant’s clients. The Respondent is further accused of concealing their identity through privacy registration services, failing to respond to cease and desist requests, and offering to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The Complainant contends that these actions were undertaken in bad faith, with the intent to disrupt the Complainant’s business and profit from the reputation of the OddsPortal brand.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant asserts rights in the registered trademark “OddsPortal,” protected in the EU and the United Kingdom, and claims longstanding use of the domain <oddsportal.com> since May 18, 2007. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark and domain name. The similarity arises from the use of identical root words (“ODD” and “PORTAL”) and the addition of a single letter (“S”), which constitutes a case of misspelling or typosquatting. The Complainant argues that this optical similarity is likely to mislead users, especially given the fame and recognition of the OddsPortal brand among sports information users and search engines.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is alleged to have registered the domain for fraudulent purposes, including the creation of e-mail addresses (bogdan@oddportals.com and martin@oddportals.com) used to impersonate Livesport employees and communicate with the Complainant's clients. The Complainant further notes the Respondent's use of privacy or proxy registration services, which prevents direct contact and resolution. The submission emphasizes that the Respondent's activities—misspelling, typosquatting, and fraudulent communications—do not constitute bona fide use or legitimate interests under the Policy.

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is accused of knowingly targeting a well-known trademark with the intent to disrupt the Complainant's business and to profit from the reputation of the OddsPortal brand. Evidence of bad faith includes the use of the domain for phishing and scam communications, concealment of identity, failure to respond to cease and desist requests, and an offer to sell the disputed domain to the Complainant for EUR 3,500. The Complainant argues that these actions demonstrate both bad faith registration and use, with the sole purpose of commercial gain and disruption of the Complainant's business. The submission references prior UDRP decisions (CAC-UDRP-106228, CAC-UDRP-104192, CAC-UDRP-104299, CAC-UDRP-102392) in support of its position.

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

However, the Complainant submitted an e-mail dated December 8, 2025, from the address martin@oddportals.com, which is associated with the disputed domain name. The e-mail clearly responds to the notice of the commencement of the UDRP Administrative Proceeding No 108127 and, in it, the person identified as "Martin Matějka" states "why you paid 860EUR? send me only 500EUR, will transfer domain to you." It is therefore evident that the Respondent was informed about the commencement of the proceedings and reacted by requesting payment of 500 EUR.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:
(i) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
(ii) The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
(iii) The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid rights for the EU and UK trademark's registrations "OddsPortal" registered from January 12, 2009. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates two root words ("ODD" and "PORTAL") from the trademark and the only difference is between the trademark and the disputed domain name is the transfer of letter "S" from the middle of the trademark to the end of the disputed domain name, i.e. creating the plural of these root words. Such change constitutes an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark ODDPORTAL and is characteristic of a typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. The slight spelling variations does not

prevent a domain name from being confusing similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The addition of the generic top-level domain ".COM" does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to Complainant's trademark and should be, therefore, disregarded.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case (not challenged by the Respondent who did not file any response to the complaint) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

While failure to respond does not per se demonstrate that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests, it allows the Panel to draw such inferences as it considers appropriate, see paragraph 14(b) of the Rules and CAC-UDRP-101284 or CAC-UDRP-106228 "A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable inferences may be drawn from the information provided by the complainant".

There is no evidence that the Respondent is related in any way with the Complainant, is a distributor, agent, or business partner of the Complainant, and that the Respondent has been authorized or licensed to use the OddsPortal trademark or any domain name incorporating it.

The Complainant provided evidence that the disputed domain name was used to create e-mail addresses used to communicate with the third parties and pretending to be those of the Complainant's employees. The disputed domain name has been therefore used for likely fraudulent purposes and for impersonating the Complainant.

Under WIPO Overview 3.0 "panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent" (see section 2.13.1).

Besides, as reflected in WIPO Overview 3.0 "a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner" (see 2.5), and the Panel finds that this applies to the present dispute since the disputed domain name incorporate the Complainant's trademark and its use impersonates the Complainant.

Given the Respondent's failure to respond and the absence of any apparent legitimate use of the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name which consists of the Complainant's trademark OddsPortal with only one small change of the position of letter "S". The Complainant presented evidence that shows, that the trademark OddsPortal is extensively used commercially. It is reasonable to infer that the Respondent was aware of the existence and reputation of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was further used to create e-mail addresses impersonating the Complainant and used to communicate with the third parties pretending to be the communication from the Complainant. Such use could, therefore, disrupt the business of the Complainant (paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy) or attract the internet users to the corresponding web page by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The Panel therefore considers that 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.

The Panel finally considers that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has thus established all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **oddportals.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Petr Hostaš**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-06

Publish the Decision