Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108400

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108400
Time of filing	2026-02-16 11:15:39
Domain names	rocketplayx.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	PULSUP LTD

Respondent

Name	Columbus Walter

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings in respect of the domain name <rocketplayx.com> (the "disputed domain name").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, PULSUP LTD, is the holder of several trade marks for the word mark ROCKETPLAY, including, inter alia:

- Australian trade mark registration no. 2499913, registered on 18 November 2024; and
- EU trade mark registration no. 018992626, registered on 7 November 2025.

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

The Complainant also relies on unregistered rights arising from continuous use of the ROCKETPLAY mark since 2020.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Complainant's Assertions

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Cyprus and operates an online gambling platform under the name ROCKETPLAY, available at <rocketplay.com> since 2020.

The platform provides real-money online casino services and has obtained a degree of recognition within the iGaming sector. The case record includes evidence of industry awards, nominations, and favourable consumer reviews on independent platforms.

The Complainant retains ownership of the ROCKETPLAY trade mark and associated intellectual property, including branding elements and website design.

B. Respondent's Position

The Respondent has not participated in the proceedings and has not asserted any rights in the disputed domain name.

C. Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name <rocketplayx.com> was registered on 6 March 2025.

The evidence indicates that the disputed domain name has been associated with content reproducing elements of the Complainant's branding and website presentation. The case record further shows that access to the corresponding website has been restricted at times, while the domain name remains active and accessible through search engine indexing.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant

A.1 The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates its ROCKETPLAY trade mark in its entirety, with the addition of the letter "x". It submits that the mark remains clearly recognisable within the disputed domain name and that the addition of a single letter does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant characterises this addition as a minor typographical variation.

The Complainant further contends that the generic Top-Level Domain (the "TLD") <.com> should be disregarded for the purposes of comparison.

A.2 The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It states that the Respondent has not been authorised to use the ROCKETPLAY trade mark and that there is no relationship between the Parties. The Complainant further submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or holds any corresponding trade mark rights.

The Complainant also relies on evidence that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with content reproducing elements of the Complainant's branding, including references to its services and visual features of its website. It submits that such use is inconsistent with any legitimate commercial or non-commercial activity.

A.3 The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered with knowledge of its ROCKETPLAY trade mark, which it states had already acquired goodwill and recognition at the time of registration.

It further contends that the disputed domain name constitutes a typographical variation of its mark and is indicative of targeting.

The Complainant relies on evidence that the disputed domain name has been used in a manner reproducing elements of its branding and website presentation, including visual features, and that such use creates a likelihood of confusion as to source or affiliation.

The Complainant also refers to evidence that the disputed domain name has appeared in search engine results displaying its branding and that users have accessed the domain name directly. It submits that these factors support a finding that the Respondent has sought to attract Internet users through confusion with the Complainant's mark.

A.4 Relief Sought

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name <rocketplayx.com> be transferred to the Complainant in accordance with 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 name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark 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 name (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 name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and the CAC Supplemental Rules have been met. The dispute is properly before the Panel.

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 name is 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 name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the ROCKETPLAY trade mark.

The disputed domain name incorporates that trade mark in its entirety. The addition of the letter "x" does not prevent the mark from being recognisable within the disputed domain name. The Panel considers that such a minor variation is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trade mark. The TLD <.com> is without legal significance in this assessment.

The Panel therefore concludes that 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 name. The Respondent has not submitted a Response.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorised to use the Complainant's trade mark, is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or has made any legitimate use of it. The Panel notes in particular that the disputed domain name has not been shown to be used for any independent or descriptive purpose, nor does it correspond to any apparent business or identity of the Respondent.

While the record indicates that the disputed domain name has been associated with content reflecting the Complainant's branding, the relevance of this conduct under the present element is limited to confirming the absence of any bona fide offering or legitimate non-commercial use.

In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant had established rights in the ROCKETPLAY trade mark.

The Panel does not consider it necessary to characterise the Complainant's mark as highly distinctive. However, the evidence indicates that the mark had been used for several years in connection with the Complainant's services and had acquired a degree of recognition within a developing market segment.

In those circumstances, and having regard to the incorporation of the ROCKETPLAY trade mark in its entirety within the disputed

domain name, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant at the time of registration. In particular, the Panel considers that the combination of prior use and the structure of the disputed domain name supports an inference of targeting. The addition of the letter "x" constitutes a minor variation which does not meaningfully distinguish the disputed domain name and is consistent with a form of typosquatting.

Unlike the analysis under the previous element, the Panel places weight here on the manner in which the disputed domain name has been used. The evidence shows that the Respondent reproduced elements of the Complainant's branding and website presentation, including visual features, in a way capable of conveying an impression of association.

The Panel also takes into account that the disputed domain name appeared in search engine results displaying the Complainant's branding, together with evidence of direct user access. These matters support the inference that the Respondent's conduct was directed at Internet users familiar with the Complainant.

In the absence of any plausible good-faith explanation, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

E. Decision

For the reasons set out above, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy and Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <rocketplayx.com> be transferred to the Complainant, PULSUP LTD.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **rocketplayx.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Yana Zhou**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-01

Publish the Decision