Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108283

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108283
Time of filing	2026-01-20 15:27:28
Domain names	wantedwin-casino.org, crusinocasino.org, richardcasinosite.com, staycasinosite.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	XAVI GROUP LIMITED

Respondents

Name	Dasha Dorofeeva
Name	Daria Dorofeieva
Name	Dasha Dorofeeva

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings in respect of the domain names <wantedwin-casino.org>, <crusinocasino.org>, <richardcasinosite.com> and <staycasinosite.com> (collectively, "the Disputed Domain Names").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, Xavi Group Limited, is the holder of the following registered trade marks, among others:

- EU trade mark registration no. 018955176 for the word mark CRUSINO, filed on 23 November 2023;
- EU trade mark registration no. 018892019 for the word mark WANTEDWIN, filed on 22 June 2023;
- EU trade mark registration no. 018364397 for the word mark STAYCASINO, filed on 24 December 2020; and
- EU trade mark registration no. 018877233 for the word mark RICHARDCASINO, filed on 19 May 2023.

(Each "a trade mark" and collectively "the Complainant's trade marks").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Complainant's Assertions

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Cyprus that operates in the online gambling sector. The Complainant's trade marks are used in connection with online casino services and related digital gaming activities.

The Complainant operates official websites corresponding to its trade marks and offers online gaming services to customers in various jurisdictions.

B. The Respondent's Position

The Respondent did not submit a Response within the time prescribed under the UDRP Rules and has not otherwise participated in this proceeding.

C. The Disputed Domain Names

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on 24 December 2024.

At the time of writing, the Disputed Domain Names resolve to active websites redirecting Internet users to online gambling platforms ("the Respondent's websites").

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant

A.1 Preliminary Matter: Consolidation

The Complainant requests consolidation of the proceedings in respect of the Disputed Domain Names <wantedwin-casino.org>, <crusinocasino.org>, <richardcasinosite.com> and <staycasinosite.com>, pursuant to paragraphs 3(c) and 10(e) of the UDRP Rules.

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Names are subject to common ownership and control. Although minor variations appear in the registrant's name (Daria Dorofeieva/Dasha Dorofeeva), these are said to reflect linguistic and transliteration variants rather than distinct individuals.

The Complainant relies on identical contact details associated with all registrations, including the same address in Kyiv, Ukraine, the same telephone number, the same email address, and identical registrant, administrative, technical and billing contact information. All Disputed Domain Names were registered with the same registrar on 24 December 2024 and are shielded by the same privacy service.

The Complainant further submits that the Disputed Domain Names follow a consistent structural pattern, each incorporating one of the Complainant's trade marks combined with descriptive casino-related terms. The corresponding websites redirect Internet users to online gambling platforms and, in earlier versions, contained cross-links to the other Disputed Domain Names.

According to the Complainant, these cumulative circumstances demonstrate common control. Consolidation is said to promote procedural efficiency, avoid inconsistent decisions, and not prejudice the Respondent.

A.2 Substantive grounds

A.2.1 The Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to trade marks in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant submits that each Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade marks within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy

The Disputed Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trade marks in their entirety and merely append descriptive or generic terms such as "casino" or "site", including hyphenation where applicable.

The Complainant relies on section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("the WIPO Overview 3.0"), and relevant UDRP precedent, arguing that the addition of descriptive terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the Complainant’s trade marks remain clearly recognisable within the Disputed Domain Names.

A.2.2 The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorised or licensed to use the trade marks, and is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

The Complainant argues that the nature of the Disputed Domain Names creates a risk of implied affiliation. The associated websites redirect Internet users to online gambling platforms and contain statements indicating that they may include affiliate links. The Complainant submits that this constitutes commercial use.

Relying on sections 2.1, 2.5.1 and 2.5.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the Complainant argues that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

A.2.3 The Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) and paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP Policy.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered after the Complainant had obtained rights in the trade marks and after corresponding

official websites had gone live.

Prior to cease-and-desist correspondence dated 16 December 2025, the Disputed Domain Names redirected users to the third-party domain name <1wtauc.com>. Following the cease-and-desist letters, the Respondent modified the websites so that they redirected to other gambling-related domain names incorporating the Complainant's trade marks. The websites include statements that may contain affiliate links.

The Complainant submits that this demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's trade marks. The Complainant further relies on the Respondent's use of a privacy service and the registration of multiple domain names incorporating the Complainant's trade marks as evidence of a pattern of conduct. The Respondent did not reply to the cease-and-desist letters.

A.3 Remedy Sought

The Complainant requests transfer of the Disputed Domain Names to the Complainant, Xavi Group Limited, pursuant to paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy.

B. Respondent

No Response was filed. The Panel therefore proceeds on the basis of the uncontested evidence and may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to Rule 14(b) of the UDRP Rules.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to trade marks in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

1. Consolidation

Under paragraphs 3(c) and 10 (e) of the UDRP Rules, the Panel may consolidate multiple domain names into a single proceeding where they are subject to common control and where consolidation is fair and procedurally efficient.

All Disputed Domain Names were registered on the same date with the same registrar and are shielded by the same privacy service. The underlying registrant details are materially identical. The variations in the registrant's name appear consistent with transliteration differences.

The Disputed Domain Names share a common structural pattern, incorporating the Complainant's trade marks with descriptive casino-related terms. The associated websites display coordinated operation, including cross-linking.

On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Names are under common control. Consolidation in the circumstances promotes procedural efficiency and does not prejudice the Respondent. The request for consolidation is therefore granted.

2. Procedural compliance

The Panel finds that all procedural requirements under the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and CAC's UDRP Supplemental Rules, have been satisfied. The matter is properly before the Panel.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Applicable Legal Framework

Pursuant to Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel decides on the basis of the statements and evidence submitted, in accordance with the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and any applicable principles of law.

Under Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP Policy, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that:

i. The Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

ii. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and

iii. The Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

These requirements are cumulative; failure to establish any of them is fatal to the Complaint.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the trade marks CRUSINO, WANTEDWIN, STAYCASINO and RICHARDCASINO.

Each Disputed Domain Name incorporates the relevant trade mark in its entirety. The addition of descriptive terms such as "casino" or "site" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's trade marks are readily discernible within the Disputed Domain Names.

The requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. The Respondent has not submitted a Response.

The evidence shows that the Disputed Domain Names are used to redirect Internet users to gambling platforms for apparent commercial gain. Such use, which trades on the Complainant's trade marks and creates a likelihood of implied affiliation, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Names were registered after the Complainant acquired rights in the trade marks. Given the incorporation of the trade marks in their entirety and the nature of the associated websites, the Panel infers that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trade marks at the time of registration.

The Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Names to redirect Internet users to gambling platforms for commercial gain, including through affiliate links. This constitutes an intentional attempt to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP Policy.

The coordinated registration of multiple domain names incorporating the Complainant's trade marks further supports a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the UDRP Policy.

The requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

E. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy and Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Names <wantedwin-casino.org>, <crusinocasino.org>, <richardcasinosite.com> and <staycasinosite.com> be transferred to the Complainant, Xavi Group Limited.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **wantedwin-casino.org**: Transferred
2. **crusinocasino.org**: Transferred

3. **richardcasinosite.com**: Transferred
4. **staycasinosite.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Gustavo Moser**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-22

Publish the Decision