Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108488

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108488
Time of filing	2026-03-12 13:24:20
Domain names	1-xbetindia.net , 1-xbetindia.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	Dilafruz Erdonova

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has proved to own the following trademark rights, inter alia:

- European Union trademark 1XBET No. 014227681 registered on September 21, 2015 (renewed) and covering services in classes 35, 41 and 42;
- European Union figurative trademark 1XBET No. 017517327 registered on March 7, 2018 and covering services in classes 41 and 42;
- European Union figurative trademark 1XBET No. 017517384 registered on March 7, 2018 and covering services in classes 41 and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, MOKVEZA LTD, forms part of a group of companies operating under the trademark name “1XBET” an online gaming platform. The 1XBET platform offers a range of services such as sports betting, lotteries, bingo, and live betting. The 1XBET platform was founded in 2007 and holds a license issued by the government of Curaçao. It is also a sponsor of soccer

competitions.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names <1-xbetindia.net> and <1-xbetindia.com> on July 9, 2024.

The Complainant submitted the following documents to prove the abovementioned facts:

- Annex-1-1: xBet-Bookmaker-Best-Betting-Sites-2024
- Annex-2a: photo-2024-04-04-12-49-19
- Annex-2b: 1xbet.com
- Annex-2c: 1xbet.com
- Annex-2d: 1xbet.com
- Annex-2 e: 1xbet.com
- Annex-3: FC-Barcelona-adds-1XBET-as-a-new-global-partner
- Annex-4: Liverpool-go-all-in-with-1xBet-SportsPro
- Annex-5: OG-Esports-and-1xBET-join-forces-in-new-partnership-OG
- Annex-6a: Whois-1-xbetindia.net
- Annex-6b: Whois-1-xbetindia.com
- Annex-7a: EUTM-certificate-017517384-1XBET
- Annex-7b: EUTM-certificate-017517327-1XBET
- Annex-7c: EM500000014227681-1XBET-WORD
- Annex-8-1: 1xBet-Online-Casino-India-Games-Bonuses-Promotions
- Annex-8-1: 1xBet-Online-Casino-India-Games-Bonuses-Promotions-EN-translation
- Annex-9: 1xbet-Hledat-Googlem
- Annex-10: redirection-Google-Chrome-2026-03-12-12-57-46

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.
No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

1. Consolidation of the complaint for the disputed domain names

As stated in section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") when considering consolidation requests panels should look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency underpins such consideration.

The Panel notes that it is for the complainant to expressly request consolidation and to provide supporting arguments in this respect.

In the present case, however, the record shows that the disputed domain names were both registered on July 9, 2024, and share the same registrant and registrar. These elements support a finding that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

In the absence of any indication that consolidation would be unfair or prejudicial to the Respondent, and in the interest of procedural efficiency, the Panel finds that consolidation of the Complaint is appropriate in this case.

2. Procedural compliance

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

Identity (paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names <1-xbetindia.net> and <1-xbetindia.com> are confusingly similar to the Complainant's 1XBET trademarks.

The Complainant's 1XBET trademarks are incorporated in their entirety into the disputed domain names, together with the term "india" and a hyphen between terms that form the Complainant's trademarks.

Nevertheless, these additions do not prevent confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademarks. Indeed, the trademarks remain recognizable within the disputed domain names.

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).

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks.

Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests (paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy)

The Complainant asserted that the Respondent has never been licensed or authorized to use the Complainant's 1XBET trademarks in the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names are being used for the sole purpose of impersonating the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the Respondent, identified as "Dilafruz Erdonova", is not commonly known by the name "1XBET". The Panel notes that there has been no evidence showing that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain names and is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the contrary, the Panel finds that the structure of the disputed domain names, incorporating the Complainant's 1XBET trademark in its entirety together with the geographical term "India", is inherently misleading and suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. Such composition carries a clear risk of implied affiliation and is likely to lead Internet users to believe that the disputed domain names are operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks any right or legitimate interest in using the disputed domain names. The use of the disputed domain names for the purpose of impersonating the Complainant does not confer upon the Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in those domain names.

Finally, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide its arguments in support of its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure as it considers appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Rules.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

Bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.)

In the light of the records, the Complainant showed the disputed domain names are consequently similar to the 1XBET trademarks. It is inconceivable to the Panel that the Respondent could have coincidentally chosen the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant's 1XBET trademarks, particularly as the disputed domain names redirects to a website featuring the 1XBET trademarks. The Panel further notes that the Complainant's 1XBET trademarks have no meaning and are completely original and distinctive. Arguably, the Respondent registered said domain names knowing that the trademark benefited from a significant online presence. Moreover, the time of the registration, namely July 2024, is well posterior to the registration of 1XBET trademarks.

Therefore, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent was well aware of the 1XBET trademarks and has registered the dispute domain name with the intention to refer to the Complainant and to take advantage of its trademarks.

Furthermore, it seems that the Respondent has registered the dispute domain names in bad faith for the sole purpose to attract Internet users for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's 1XBET trademarks.

In fact, the disputed domain names resolve to a website that repeatedly feature the 1XBET trademarks and lead Internet users to believe they are accessing an official Indian portal of the Complainant or authorized local platforms of the Complainant in India. Such use is likely to mislead internet users for the Respondent's benefit and to divert them from the Complainant's genuine business.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has previously been involved in a domain name dispute concerning another online betting operator in which the panel ordered the transfer of the domain name (See WIPO Case No. D2023-5368 Kaizen Gaming International Limited v. Dilafruz Erdonova).

While each case must be assessed on its individual circumstances, the Panel considers that the findings in the prior decision, when viewed together with the facts of the present case, support the inference that the Respondent's conduct may form part of a pattern of registering domain names targeting third-party trademarks. This constitutes an additional factor pointing to bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

To the Panel's opinion, this shows that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **1-xbetindia.net** : Transferred
2. **1-xbetindia.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Nathalie Dreyfus**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-16

Publish the Decision