Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108221

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108221
Time of filing	2025-12-06 09:42:10
Domain names	1xbetwalletagent.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	MOKVEZA LTD

Complainant representative

Organization	Sindelka & Lachmannová advokáti s.r.o.

Respondent

Name	Abir Khan

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 owns EU trademark registration no. 014227681 for the term '1XBET', which was registered 21 September 2015 for various services in classes 35, 41, and 42 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark"). The Complainant also owns a stylised trademark containing the Trademark in italics against a dark blue background, with the two characters '1X' in white and the characters 'BET' in light blue (EU trademark registration no. 017517327, registered on 7 March 2018).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant belongs to a group of companies operating under the brand name 1xBET. Founded in 2007, the Complainant is an online gaming platform offering sports betting, lottery, bingo, live betting, lottery, and more. The Complainant has won several awards and has been nominated for many more, including the SBC Awards, the Global Gaming Awards and the International Gaming Awards. Furthermore, the Complainant is the official presenting partner of Italy's Serie A and the media partner of Spain's La Liga. The Complainant also sponsors a number of major international tournaments, including the Africa Cup of Nations.

The Complainant's website can be found at <1xbet.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on 27 July 2024 and is being used in connection with a website featuring the Complainant's stylised trademark alongside the slogan “Earn Online With 1XBET the best in WALLET AGENT” and advertising an

agent program related to the Complainant's business.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark as it fully incorporates the Trademark and as the mere addition of the descriptive terms “wallet” and “agent” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that they have not licensed or authorized the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name, that the Respondent is not affiliated with them in any way, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks. The Complainant also states that the Respondent is not using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, and that the Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of it. Regarding a bona fide offering of goods and services, the Complainant argues that the website associated with the disputed domain name has not been authorized or approved by the Complainant and cannot be considered ‘fair’ as it constitutes clear impersonation and is intentionally aimed at misleading Internet users.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. They argue that the Respondent is deliberately targeting them and has intentionally selected a domain name that is confusingly similar to their well-known Trademark in order to benefit from its reputation and global online presence. The Complainant further argues that the content of the Respondent's website clearly intends to create an association with the Trademark and cause confusion among Internet users, and that the Respondent repeatedly quotes the Trademark on the website. Regarding bad faith use, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is attempting to attract internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark for commercial gain.

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; 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.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark, as it fully incorporates the well-established Trademark and merely includes the descriptive terms “wallet” and “agent” at the end of the second-level domain name. The Trademark, however, is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and, therefore, failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Based on the evidence on file, the Panel cannot find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent either, as the disputed domain name is not generic and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not indicate the existence of any rights or legitimate interests of its own. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name under paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

3. The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark. This finding is supported by the facts that the Trademark has been in extensive use long before the registration of the disputed domain name, that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in the Complainant's field of business and, above all, that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a website that includes the Complainant's stylised trademark. Regarding bad faith use, by utilizing the disputed domain name for a website promoting an agent program related to the Complainant's business, the Respondent was, in all likelihood, trying to divert traffic intended for the Complainant’s website to its own for commercial gain as set out under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **1xbetwalletagent.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Peter Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-08

Publish the Decision