Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108483

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108483
Time of filing	2026-03-11 16:14:02
Domain names	1xbett-official.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	MOKVEZA LTD

Complainant representative

Organization	Sindelka & Lachmannová advokáti s.r.o.

Respondent

Name	Olga Kotliarova

Respondent representative

Name	Olga Kotliarova

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 <1xbett-official.com>.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

MOKVEZA LTD (the “Complainant”) is the owner of the 1XBET trademarks and forms part of a group of companies operating under the brand name “1XBET”, an online gaming platform with a worldwide reach.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations for the mark 1XBET, including both word and figurative marks in various jurisdictions.

These include, for example:

- European Union trademark No. 014227681 (word mark), registered on September 21, 2015;
- European Union figurative trademark No. 017517327, registered on March 7, 2018;
- European Union figurative trademark No. 017517384, registered on March 7, 2018.

These trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name on January 10, 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, MOKVEZA LTD, forms part of a group of companies operating under the brand name "1XBET", an online gaming platform with a worldwide reach. The 1XBET platform was founded in 2007 and offers a range of services including sports betting, live betting, lottery, and other gaming products. The platform operates under a license issued by the government of Curaçao and promotes responsible gambling practices.

Over time, 1XBET has established a strong presence in the global online gambling market. The brand has received multiple industry awards and nominations, including recognition at the SBC Awards, Global Gaming Awards, and International Gaming Awards.

The 1XBET brand has also gained significant visibility through sponsorship and partnership agreements with major sports organizations. These include partnerships with top football competitions such as Italy's Serie A and Spain's La Liga, as well as sponsorship of international tournaments including the Africa Cup of Nations. In addition, 1XBET has entered into high-profile partnerships with football clubs such as FC Barcelona (2019) and Liverpool FC (2019), and with esports organization OG Esports (2022).

The Complainant operates the domain name <1xbet.com>, which resolves to its official online betting platform and is used in connection with its 1XBET trademark.

The identity of the registrant of the disputed domain name was not known to the Complainant at the time of filing the Complaint.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

• The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the protected mark

The Complainant submits that, by virtue of its registered 1XBET trademarks, it has established rights in the 1XBET mark.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name <1xbett-official.com> is confusingly similar to its 1XBET trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety, subject only to a minor misspelling consisting of the addition of a second letter "t" in the element "bett", together with the inclusion of the term "official" and a hyphen.

The Complainant contends that such a minor alteration constitutes a typical case of typosquatting and does not prevent the Complainant's mark from remaining clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the addition of the term "official" may reinforce the false impression that the disputed domain name is authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant further relies on section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, according to which the addition of descriptive or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the relevant trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard technical requirement and should be disregarded for the purpose of the confusing similarity assessment.

On this basis, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its 1XBET trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

• The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name

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

The disputed domain name was registered on January 10, 2025, i.e. many years after the registration of the Complainant's 1XBET trademarks.

The Complainant states that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its 1XBET trademark, nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent, Olga Kotliarova, is commonly known by the disputed domain name or holds any corresponding trademark rights.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of

goods or services, nor making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the structure of the disputed domain name — incorporating the 1XBET trademark together with the term “official” — creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant. In this regard, the Complainant relies on section 2.5.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, which provides that a respondent cannot claim fair use where a domain name falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website which, according to the Complainant, imitates the Complainant’s official platform. The Complainant submits that the website reproduces its trademark, adopts a similar visual appearance, including a blue-and-white color scheme, and presents itself as an official 1XBET platform, including statements such as “Official website of the online casino – 1Xbet Casino.”

The Complainant argues that such use is intended to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated or authorized by the Complainant. The website does not disclose the identity of the operator, nor does it contain any disclaimer clarifying the lack of affiliation.

The Complainant further submits that such conduct constitutes impersonation and cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests. In this regard, the Complainant refers to section 2.13.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, which confirms that the use of a domain name for fraudulent or deceptive purposes, including impersonation, cannot establish rights or legitimate interests.

On this basis, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

According to the Complainant, the 1XBET mark is widely known in the online gambling sector and enjoys a strong online presence. The Complainant contends that a simple Internet search for the term “1xbet” would have revealed the Complainant, its trademarks, and its business activities. The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent was, or should have been, aware of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s 1XBET trademark in its entirety, together with a minor misspelling (“1xbett”) and the term “official.” According to the Complainant, this composition is intended to create the false impression of an official or authorized connection with the Complainant and demonstrates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its trademarks in mind.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduces the 1XBET trademark, which confirms that the Respondent registered the domain name with the intention of targeting the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that falsely presents itself as an official 1XBET platform and prominently uses the Complainant’s trademark. The inclusion of the term “official” in the disputed domain name reinforces the misleading impression that the website is operated or authorized by the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that such use is intended to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. Internet users may be misled into believing that they are interacting with the Complainant and may be induced to register or engage with the platform on that basis.

The Complainant relies on prior UDRP decisions holding that the use of a domain name incorporating a complainant’s trademark, combined with content that mimics or impersonates the complainant’s official website, constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In light of the above, the Complainant submits 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.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy are satisfied and requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent submits that the disputed domain name was used for informational purposes only and without any intent to mislead Internet users or to profit from the Complainant’s trademark.

According to the Respondent, the website associated with the disputed domain name serves as a review resource describing the main characteristics of the Complainant’s brand. The Respondent contends that such use constitutes an exercise of freedom of expression and falls within the scope of nominative fair use.

The Respondent further argues that the use of the 1XBET trademark is necessary to identify the subject of the review. The Respondent also claims that the website contains a disclaimer indicating that it is not affiliated with or endorsed by the

Complainant.

Complainant's Supplemental Filing

The Complainant submitted a supplemental filing in response to the arguments raised by the Respondent, in particular the claim that the disputed domain name was used for informational purposes and that the website allegedly contained a disclaimer.

The Complainant submits that it could not reasonably have anticipated these arguments at the time of filing the Complaint and therefore considers the supplemental filing justified.

The Complainant further argues that the Panel's assessment should be based on the circumstances at the time of filing of the Complaint (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.11), and that subsequent changes to the website, including its removal or inaccessibility, do not affect the assessment of bad faith or create rights or legitimate interests.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name <1xbett-official.com> is inherently misleading, as it incorporates the 1XBET trademark with a minor typographical variation and the term "official," thereby suggesting an authorized connection with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that, at the time of filing, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that reproduced the Complainant's branding, including a similar color scheme, and prominently used the 1XBET trademark in connection with betting-related content. The website also included statements such as "Official website of the online casino – 1Xbet Casino," which, according to the Complainant, demonstrate impersonation rather than legitimate informational use.

The Complainant further notes that the website has since become inaccessible and now displays a blocking or security page. It submits that such change does not affect the assessment of bad faith, and refers to established UDRP practice that passive holding of a domain name targeting a well-known mark may constitute bad faith (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3).

On this basis, the Complainant maintains that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in 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 the UDRP have been met.

A Response was filed in this proceeding. The Complainant subsequently submitted a supplemental filing addressing arguments raised in the Response.

The Panel, in the exercise of its discretion, admits the supplemental filing, as it is relevant to issues raised in the Response and the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant could not reasonably have addressed these matters in the Complaint.

The Panel notes that unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged; however, panels may admit such filings where justified by their relevance and the circumstances of the case (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.6).

There is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to proceed to a decision in this case.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The UNIFORM DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (UDRP) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) (the “Policy”) provides that a complainant must prove each of the following to obtain transfer or cancellation of the domain name:

1. that respondent’s domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights; and

2. that respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

3. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant holds valid trademark rights in the 1XBET mark.

The disputed domain name <1xbett-official.com> incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, subject only to a minor typographical variation consisting of the addition of a second letter “t” (“1xbett”), together with the term “official” and a hyphen.

The Panel finds that such minor alteration constitutes a typical example of typosquatting, which does not prevent the Complainant’s mark from being clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The addition of the term “official” does not dispel confusing similarity. On the contrary, it reinforces the impression that the disputed domain name is affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant.

It is well established that where a complainant’s trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8).

The generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s 1XBET trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant has established 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 (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1).

The Panel notes that the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its 1XBET trademark and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent contends that the disputed domain name is used for informational purposes as a review website and relies on principles of nominative fair use and freedom of expression. The Respondent further asserts that the website includes a disclaimer of affiliation.

The Panel does not find this argument persuasive.

The disputed domain name — incorporating a misspelled version of the Complainant’s trademark together with the term “official” — inherently suggests an official or authorized connection with the Complainant and thus carries a high risk of implied affiliation. This is incompatible with a legitimate review or informational use (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1).

Moreover, the evidence shows that the website associated with the disputed domain name reproduced the Complainant’s branding and presented itself as an official platform, including statements such as “Official website of the online casino – 1Xbet Casino.” Such use goes beyond nominative fair use and constitutes impersonation of the Complainant. This conduct is inherently misleading and cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name to impersonate a complainant or falsely suggest affiliation does not confer rights or legitimate interests (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1).

In these circumstances, any disclaimer, even if present, would not be sufficient to cure the misleading nature of the disputed domain name and the overall presentation of the website.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has not provided evidence of any genuine independent review activity or other legitimate purpose.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant’s 1XBET trademark significantly predates the registration of the disputed domain name and has acquired substantial recognition in the online betting sector.

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, subject only to a minor typographical variation, and combines it with the term "official," which strongly suggests an intention to create a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant. The Panel finds that such composition is not coincidental and reflects a deliberate targeting of the Complainant's mark.

The Panel further notes that, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that reproduced the Complainant's branding and explicitly presented itself as an official platform, including statements such as "Official website of the online casino – 1Xbet Casino." This demonstrates a clear intention to impersonate the Complainant and to mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

The Respondent contends that the website was used for informational purposes and included a disclaimer. The Panel is not persuaded by this argument. In circumstances where the domain name itself suggests official affiliation and the website reinforces that impression, any disclaimer is insufficient to dispel the likelihood of confusion.

The Panel also takes into account the Complainant's supplemental filing, which clarifies that the website content at the time of filing included explicit representations of official status and closely imitated the Complainant's branding. The Panel accepts that such evidence could not reasonably have been anticipated in advance of the Response and considers it relevant to the assessment of bad faith.

Following the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name has become inactive. However, the Panel finds that this does not prevent a finding of bad faith. Panels have consistently held that the removal or deactivation of a website after notice of a dispute does not cure prior bad faith use. Furthermore, panels have held that passive holding of a domain name may, in appropriate circumstances, constitute bad faith (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3). In the present case, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark, the misleading composition of the disputed domain name, and the absence of any plausible good faith use, the Panel considers that the current inactivity of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Taking all circumstances into account, including the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name, the use of the term "official," and the impersonation of the Complainant's website, the Panel finds 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. **1xbett-official.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Barbora Donathová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-27

Publish the Decision