Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108498

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108498
Time of filing	2026-04-02 10:06:46
Domain names	1xslots-online.com, 1xslots-casino.in.net

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	MOKVEZA LTD

Respondents

Organization	SAROS DIGITAL SOLUTIONS LTD
Name	Roksana Sadowska

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 is the owner of several trademarks "1XSLOTS":

- Registration Number: 018947167 (figurative), Registration Date: February 20, 2024, Nice classification: 35, 41, 42, and;
- Registration Number: 018947168 (figurative), Registration Date: February 20, 2024, Nice classification: 35, 41, 42

Complainant's official platforms, 1xslots.com and 1xslot.com were registered as follows: <1xslots.com> registered on April 6, 2019 & <1xslot.com> registered on March 23, 2016.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

THE COMPLAINANT

The Complainant is the owner of the "1XSLOTS" trademarks, which are among the most recognized online gaming and betting brands worldwide. The Complainant is part of a group of companies operating under the brand "1xslots".

This brand is used exclusively on the international online gaming platforms 1xslots.com and 1xslot.com. These platforms are also an integral part of the group of companies. 1xslots offers live casino, slots, games and other gaming services. The Complainant holds a valid license issued by the Government of Curacao.

1xslots promote responsible gambling, Anti-Money Laundering (AML) policy, Know Your Customer (KYC) policy, Dispute Resolution Rules, as publicly stated on its websites.

The "1SLOTS" trademarks are widely represented and actively used in commercial activities in numerous countries, as evidenced by

registration documents identifying the countries where these trademarks are protected.

The Complainant has developed a strong global presence and a reputable standing in the online betting and gambling market.

The disputed domain names <1xslots-casino.in.net> and <1xslots-online.com> (hereinafter, the „Disputed Domain Names“) were registered as follows:

- The Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net> was created on March 9, 2026, and;
- The Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com> was created on July 30, 2020.

In accordance with the Complainant, the websites connected to the Disputed Domain Names are deliberately designed to give users the false impression of an official connection with the Complainant and its “1XSLOTS” trademarks.

According to Complainant’s non-contested allegations, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the Disputed Domain Names and the Complainant is not related in any way to the Complainant’s business.

For the purpose of this case, the Registrar confirmed that the language of the registration agreement is English and due to the existence of two different Registrants, the Complainant requested consolidation of the complaint since the Complainant believes that the Disputed Domain Names are clearly under common control.

The facts asserted by the Complainant are not contested by the Respondent.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

First element: Similarity

The Disputed Domain Names wholly incorporate the Complainant’s registered and widely known “1XSLOTS” trademarks. The addition of the generic and descriptive terms “casino” and “online” to the well-known sign does not set aside the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names and the Complainant's trademarks. The inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) “.com” and “.net” is recognized as a standard technical requirement and may be disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

The Disputed Domain Names are virtually identical to the Complainant's well-known and extensively used trademarks “1XSLOTS”. It is well accepted that the main element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademarks and the Disputed Domain Name.

The “1XSLOTS” trademarks have acquired substantial distinctiveness and significant goodwill in the global gaming and betting sector. The identical use of the “1XSLOTS” trademarks within the Disputed Domain Names creates an unlawfully deceptive impression that the Disputed Domain Names are linked to the Complainant, constituting infringement and unfair competition.

The Respondents specifically used the Complainant's trademarks “1XSLOTS” in order to pursue the goal of misleading the potential clients of the Complainant on the basis of similarity, as well as the Complainant 's inability to use Disputed Domain Names in the future. For the foregoing reasons, the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s “1XBET” trademarks.

Second element: Rights or legitimate interest

The Complainant’s “1XSLOTS” trademarks are licensed to third-party companies in the ordinary course of the Complainant’s business. The Respondents are neither one of these licensees nor otherwise authorized by the Complainant. The Respondents are not affiliated to the Complainant in any form.

The Respondents did not attempt to contact the Complainant pre- or post-registration to establish a legitimate interest or to license the mark. No individual or entity acting on behalf of the owners of the Disputed Domain Names has contacted the Complainant to request rights or permission to use the Disputed Domain Names. The Complainant has not granted permission to use the “1XSLOTS” trademarks in connection with the Disputed Domain Names, nor authorized any third party to grant such permission.

The Complainant confirms that neither it nor any of its authorized affiliates or licensees has registered, nor authorized the registration or use of, the Disputed Domain Names.

There is no evidence that the Respondents are known by the Disputed Domain Names or own any corresponding registered trademarks.

The Complainant is also unaware of any rights, including the right to use, being granted to any third party in respect of the Disputed Domain Names.

The Respondents have not been using, or preparing to use, the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names.

The composition of the Disputed Domain Names, which wholly incorporate the Complainant's registered "1XSLOTS" trademarks, clearly demonstrates the Respondent's deliberate intent to foster an association and consequently a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant, its "1XSLOTS" trademarks, and the business conducted under those marks, in the minds of internet users. This use is not coincidental; it reflects a targeted effort to exploit the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant for commercial gain.

By incorporating the "1XSLOTS" trademarks in the Disputed Domain Names, internet users may be mistakenly led to believe that the Disputed Domain Names are directly connected with, authorized by, or endorsed by the Complainant.

The repeated and unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademarks in connection with gambling services constitutes clear evidence of trademark misappropriation and creates a strong likelihood of confusion among consumers.

The websites connected to the Disputed Domain Names (hereinafter, the „Infringing Websites") are deliberately designed to give users the false impression of an official connection with the Complainant and its "1XSLOTS" trademarks.

Visual and Structural Mimicry. The Infringing Websites replicate the overall structure and the signature black-yellow-and-white color palette of the Complainant's official platforms, 1xslots.com and 1xslot.com. Furthermore, the official "1XSLOTS" trademarks are displayed on both Infringing Websites in the exact same position (typically the top-left corner) as on the official platforms, utilizing identical fonts, proportions, and UI/UX elements. This precise replication is clearly intended to deceive users into believing they are on an authorized resource.

Overlapping Services and Nice Classification. The Infringing Websites offer gambling and betting services that fall directly within Classes 35, 41, and 42 of the Nice Classification, for which the "1XSLOTS" trademarks are registered. These services are identical to those provided by the Complainant. By offering competing services under a nearly identical brand, the Respondents are actively misappropriating the Complainant's goodwill for commercial gain.

Pattern of Technical Redirection. The Respondents further mimic the Complainant's operational behavior to enhance the illusion of legitimacy. Upon visiting the <1xslots.com>, users are automatically redirected to an authorized platform (e.g., https://1xslot53441.world/en for the English version), a process fully coordinated and authorized by the Complainant.

In a clear attempt to impersonate this technical infrastructure, the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net> similarly redirects users to an unauthorized website at https://www.1xslots-casino-ru.in.net/. This unauthorized redirection confirms that the Respondent is not only copying the brand's visual identity but is also imitating its technical distribution methods to mislead both users and search engines.

The Infringing Websites provide no indications of the identity of the individual or entity operating the website or offering the advertised goods or services. Instead, the Infringing Websites merely display the Complainant's trademarks. This gives rise to an association in the minds of internet users between the Complainant and the "1XSLOTS" trademarks, leading to the mistaken belief that the Disputed Domain Names and the corresponding Infringing Websites are directly associated with the Complainant and the 1xslots platform.

No disclaimers or contact information are disclosed on the Infringing Websites to clarify the absence of any relationship with the Complainant.

The Infringing Websites fail to display any reference to, or provide a link to, a valid gambling license. Furthermore, they lack all essential details typically required for regulated gaming platforms, such as the issuing authority, license holder, license number, date of issuance, or term of validity. The absence of this information, coupled with the lack of any evidence regarding a contractual or other legal entitlement to use the Complainant's "1XSLOTS" trademarks, confirms that the Respondent has no legitimate authority to operate under the Complainant's brand. The Respondent's use of the trademarks is entirely unauthorized and intended solely to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation without adhering to the industry's regulatory standards.

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Rules, the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names.

Third element: Bad faith

The Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net> was registered on March 9, 2026, i.e., more than two (2) years after the registration of the Complainant's "1XSLOTS" trademarks (February 20, 2024). Before the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net> was registered, the "1XSLOTS" trademarks had already acquired widespread recognition and significant goodwill internationally.

The Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com> was registered on July 30, 2020. By contrast, the domain name <1xslots.com> was registered on April 6, 2019, and the domain name <1xslot.com> was registered as early as March 23, 2016. These domain names serve as the primary platforms for the Company's online gaming operations, which have legitimately and extensively used the "1XSLOTS" logos long before the Respondent's registration.

Consequently, since March 2016, more than four (4) years prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Name, the 1xslots platform has maintained a dominant online presence and has actively promoted its brand and services through its official websites.

The fact that the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com> was registered prior to the formal grant of the Complainant's trademark registrations does not preclude a finding of bad faith. The bad faith registration can be established based on the Complainant's unregistered or "common law" trademark rights that predated the domain registration. As outlined in Section 1.3 of

the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition 3.1 (“WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.), continuous and extensive use of a mark establishes secondary meaning. Here, the Complainant's continuous use of the "1XSLOTS" mark since 2016 establishes these common law rights well before the Respondent's registration date.

This is further corroborated by archived records from the Wayback Machine, which document the continuous activity of the <1xslot.com> website dating back to May 2019. Additionally, evidentiary screenshots demonstrating the website’s historical appearance and operations are attached. The services provided on the website resolving from the <1xslots-online.com> are a direct and unauthorized replication of the Complainant’s offerings.

The exact replication of the Complainant’s visual identity and service offerings is incontrovertible proof that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant’s “1XSLOTS” brand at the time of registration in July 2020. Such deliberate mirroring of <1xslots.com> and <1xslot.com> websites demonstrates that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant, which constitutes bad faith registration and use regardless of the formal trademark registration date.

This appropriation of the Complainant’s business model and branding was carried out without any prior or subsequent authorization, license, or consent. There has been no communication, discussion, or commercial relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that would justify the use of the “1XSLOTS” logos and trademarks. The Respondents are neither an authorized agent nor an affiliate of the Complainant, and its use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes a clear case of trademark infringement aimed at misleading the public.

A simple search on popular search engines for the term “1xslots” would inevitably inform the Respondents about <1xslots.com> and <1xslot.com>), as the majority of search results directly relate to <1xslots.com> and <1xslot.com>, its business activities, or related topics.

The Complainant submits that the circumstances of this case fall squarely within the scope of Section 3.8.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, which establishes that bad faith is found where “the respondent’s intent in registering the domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant’s nascent (typically as yet unregistered) trademark rights”. It is manifest that the Respondents acted in bad faith by preemptively registering the Disputed Domain Names to exploit the Complainant’s growing reputation.

Furthermore, the Respondent’s bad faith is clearly demonstrated under the following criteria of Section 3.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1:

- Disruption of Business (Section 3.1 (iii)): the Respondent “has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor”. By intercepting potential customers intended for the Complainant’s official platforms, the Respondents inflict direct commercial harm;
- Likelihood of Confusion for Commercial Gain (Section 3.1 (iv)): “by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website …, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark … or of a … service on the respondent’s website …”. The identical visual presentation of the Infringing Websites further exacerbates this confusion.

Additionally, as a secondary but compelling argument, the Respondent’s actions bear the hallmarks of Section 3.1 (ii) of the WIPO Overview 3.1, in that “the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark … from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name”. This “blocking” tactic effectively deprives the Complainant of its legitimate right to expand its digital presence under its own brand name.

The registration of the Disputed Domain Names, which contains the well-known “1XSLOTS” trademarks, is clearly intended to create a direct association with the 1xslots brand, the Complainant's “1XSLOTS” trademarks, and the domain names <1xslots.com> and <1xslot.com>.

The composition of the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net> demonstrates that the Respondent registered it with knowledge of “1XSLOTS” trademarks. This reflects an explicit intent by the Respondent to create an association and consequently induce a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks in the minds of internet users.

The Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Names is aimed at exploiting the goodwill of the Complainant’s well-known 1xslots online platform. The Complainant is of the opinion that the Respondents have registered the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant.

Moreover, the Disputed Domain Names resolve to Infringing Websites that repeatedly display the Complainant’s “1XSLOTS” trademarks. This evidence that, at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Names, the Respondents likely acquired them with the specific intent to later use them in relation to the 1xslots brand.

Notwithstanding that the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com> was registered prior to the formal registration of the Complainant’s “1XSLOTS” trademarks, the Respondent made no attempt to seek trademark registration and protection for the “1XSLOTS” sign. Furthermore, following the successful registration of the trademarks by the Complainant, the Respondent has persisted in its unauthorized and unlawful use of the mark on its website without any legal basis or authorization.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered in secrecy with Registration Data obscured, showing a clear intent to mask identity and preclude legitimate dealings with the Complainant. While the use of a privacy protection service is not inherently a violation, the concealment of the Registrant’s identity, when coupled with trademark infringement and the provision of unauthorized competing services, constitutes compelling evidence of bad faith.

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with the Rules, the Disputed Domain Names should be considered as having been registered and being used in bad faith, within the meaning of the Policy.

RESPONDENT

Respondent did not reply to the Complaint.

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

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

1. Preliminary Issue: Complaint consolidated against multiple respondents.

Paragraph 10(e) of the UDRP Rules grants a Panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. At the same time, paragraph 3(c) of the UDRP Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain-name holder.

Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels 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 would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.

In this regard, Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s).

See paragraph 4.11.2 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.

The Complainant requested this Panel to analyze the possibility that the Disputed Domain Names and the named Respondent should be consolidated in a single UDRP proceeding. As above described, the Complainant has provided with the following arguments for the consolidation request:

1. **Identical Visual Identity and Exploitation of Brand Trade Dress.** Both Infringing Websites are designed with the specific

intent to impersonate the Complainant's official platform by meticulously replicating the "1XSLOTS" brand identity. This includes:

- **Color Scheme:** An identical "black, yellow, and white" color palette, which is a signature and distinctive element of the 1xslots brand identity, is utilized across both sites to create an immediate, albeit false, sense of continuity and trust for the user;
- **Logo Placement and Typography:** The official "1XSLOTS" trademarks are displayed in the exact same position (top-left corner), utilizing the identical font, proportions, and UI/UX layout found on the Complainant's authorized resources. This level of granular mimicry is consistent with the use of a shared technical template, indicating a singular directing mind.

2. **Mirroring of Content and Technical Infrastructure.** The Infringing Websites are not merely similar; they are functional and operational mirrors of each other. This is evidenced by the fact that the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net> facilitates a complex redirection to an unauthorized website (<1xslots-casino-ru.in.net>), a technical strategy that exactly mimics the Complainant's authorized distribution methods. Such coordinated technical redirection to a common target is recognized as one of the most probative indicators of common control.
3. **Coordinated Registration and Systematic Naming Pattern.** The registration of <1xslots-casino.in.net> and <1xslots-online.com> follows a clear, methodical pattern of cybersquatting aimed at monopolizing search traffic for the "1xslots" brand:

- **Common Prefix:** Both domains utilize the trademarked term "1xslots" as the core identifier, ensuring they appear in relevant consumer searches;
- **Generic Suffixes:** The addition of the generic terms "-casino" and "-online" follows a systematic approach used to capture traffic from different search queries while maintaining brand recognition. This "bulk-targeting" strategy is a hallmark of professional cybersquatting networks.

4. **Respondent's Pattern of Conduct and History of Abusive Registrations.** The identification of SAROS DIGITAL SOLUTIONS LTD as the registrant for <1xslots-online.com> is of critical importance. This entity has a documented history of being a respondent in UDRP cases involving the Complainant's trademark and other brands (e.g., CAC Case No. CAC-UDRP-107595; WIPO Case No. D2025-5398). The fact that both Disputed Domain Names resolve to identical content while targeting the same Complainant strongly indicates that the Disputed Domain Names are mere aliases or participants in a unified affiliate scheme.

Although the Disputed Domain Names appear to be registered with different registrars, the Panel has identified, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, that the same DNS provider is used in both instances.

The Panel further agrees with the Complainant that the screenshots submitted as evidence demonstrate use of the Complainant's trademark in the manner described in the Complaint. As the Complainant has indicated, the Disputed Domain Names are not only similar, but also appear to function as operational mirrors of one another, particularly with respect to their redirection functionality, technical configuration, and domain-name composition. In particular, both Disputed Domain Names begin with the Complainant's trademark; i.e. both domains start with the trademark "1xslots" followed by a hyphen and a descriptive term; i.e. <1xslots-casino.in.net> and <1xslots-online.com>.

Finally, the Panel notes that the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com> appears to have been involved in other UDRP proceedings connected to the Complainant; i.e. UDRP Case Nr. 107595.

The Center has not received any response from either Respondent regarding the Complainant's consolidation request. On the basis of the evidence and facts submitted by the Complainant and reviewed by the Panel, the Panel finds that consolidation would be fair and equitable. Accordingly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's request to include both Disputed Domain Names in a single complaint.

2. Substantive Issues

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(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.

The Panel has reviewed in detail the evidence available to it and has come to the following conclusions concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in the proceeding:

(A) THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES TO THE COMPLAINANT'S

RIGHTS.

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy establishes the obligation of the Complainant to demonstrate that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant submitted copies of different trademark registrations pertaining to the term “1XSLOTS” for different services, including casino, gaming and gambling services, among others.

The Complainant’s trademarks were registered in February 2024 and the Disputed Domain Names were registered as follows:

- The Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net> was created on March 9, 2026, and;
- The Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com> was created on July 30, 2020.

The Panel acknowledges that the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com> was registered on July 30, 2020, which predates the Complainant’s trademark registrations by approximately four years. However, it is well-established under the UDRP that the first element serves as a standing requirement; i.e. the UDRP makes no specific reference to the date on which the holder of the trademark or service mark acquired rights as long as the trademark rights are in existence at the time the complaint is filed. See paragraph 1.1.3. of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.

In the current case, the Disputed Domain Names <1xslots-casino.in.net> and <1xslots-online.com> are composed of the trademark “1XSLOTS” plus a hyphen the generic English terms “CASINO” and “ONLINE”.

In assessing confusing similarity, the Panel finds the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, as it incorporates the entirety of the “1XSLOTS“ trademarks plus a hyphen and the generic terms “CASINO” and “ONLINE”. In this regard, UDRP panels agree that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See paragraph 1.8. of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.

UDRP panels agree that the TLD may usually be ignored for the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity between a domain name and the Complainant’s trademark as it is a technical requirement of registration. See paragraph 1.11.1 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s 1XSLOTS mark.

(B) RESPONDENT’S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES.

The second element of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. The generally adopted approach, when considering the second element, is that if a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to rebut it with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; see, for example, CAC Case No. 102333, Amedei S.r.l. v sun xin. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (see e.g. WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

In this vein, Paragraph 4 (c) provides circumstances which could prove rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name on behalf of the Respondent, such as:

(i) before any notice to Respondent of the dispute, Respondent is using or provides with demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) The Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) The Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complaint despite the efforts made by this Center to notify the Complaint. In this regard, the Complainant has confirmed in the Complaint that the Disputed Domain Name is not connected with or authorized by the Complainant in any way.

From the information provided by the Complainant, there is no evidence or reason to believe that the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

The Respondent's names “Roksana Sadowska”, “SAROS DIGITAL SOLUTIONS LTD” & “Ivaylo Tsvetanov” provided in the Registrar's verification dated 31 March 2026 are all what it links the Disputed Domain Names with the Respondent. Absent of any other evidence, such as a personal name, nickname, or corporate identifier, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

In terms of the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Infringing Websites have been used to simulate websites which are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s website. For this purpose, the Complainant presented a screenshot of the websites connected to the Disputed Domain Names where the use of the Complainant´s trademarks can be seen. In this regard, the Complainant argues the following:

- The Infringing Websites are deliberately designed to give users the false impression of an official connection with the Complainant and its "1XSLOTS" trademarks.
- Visual and Structural Mimicry. The Infringing Websites replicate the overall structure and the signature black-yellow-and-white color palette of the Complainant's official platforms, 1xslots.com and 1xslot.com. Furthermore, the official "1XSLOTS" trademarks are displayed on both Infringing Websites in the exact same position (typically the top-left corner) as on the official platforms, utilizing identical fonts, proportions, and UI/UX elements. This precise replication is clearly intended to deceive users into believing they are on an authorized resource.
- Overlapping Services and Nice Classification. The Infringing Websites offer gambling and betting services that fall directly within Classes 35, 41, and 42 of the Nice Classification, for which the "1XSLOTS" trademarks are registered. These services are identical to those provided by the Complainant. By offering competing services under a nearly identical brand, the Respondents are actively misappropriating the Complainant's goodwill for commercial gain.
- Pattern of Technical Redirection. The Respondents further mimic the Complainant's operational behavior to enhance the illusion of legitimacy. Upon visiting the <1xslots.com>, users are automatically redirected to an authorized platform (e.g., https://1xslot53441.world/en for the English version), a process fully coordinated and authorized by the Complainant. In a clear attempt to impersonate this technical infrastructure, the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net> similarly redirects users to an unauthorized website at https://www.1xslots-casino-ru.in.net/. This redirection confirms that the Respondent is not only copying the brand's visual identity but is also imitating its technical distribution methods to mislead both users and search engines. Here, it is important to mention that the Complainant was not able to provide clear evidence about the redirection; however, the Panel has decided to use its general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules to conduct a limited online search regarding the redirection from <1xslots-casino.in.net> to https://www.1xslots-casino-ru.in.net/ and it was able to confirm that said redirection is still valid.

Past panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name, provided the following cumulative requirements ("Oki Data test") are taken into account:

(i) the Respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;

(ii) the Respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;

(iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and

(iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

See paragraph 2.8 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.

From the evidence presented by the Complainant and not contested by the Respondent, it is clear that the Respondent is offering the Complainant's services without disclosing the Respondent's relationship via a disclaimer of explanation with the Complainant and the Respondent is also using the Complainant's trademark at the top of the website without proper authorization. This use does not meet the criteria laid down in the Oki Data Test and, therefore, the Respondent cannot be considered as acting with goodwill since the current use leads the Panel to believe that the Disputed Domain Names were registered with the intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Therefore, the Panel neither finds a bona fide offering of goods and services nor legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names.

In light of the reasons mentioned above, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

(C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES.

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy indicates that the Complainant must assert that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

In this sense, Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four circumstances which if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

The Respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

The Respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

by using the domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product.

For the present case, the Panel will structure its analysis as follows:

Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-casino.in.net>

The evidence at hand confirms that Complainant's 1XSLOTS trademark is distinctive and it has a strong reputation in the casino business. In addition, the Complainant's trademarks were registered before the Disputed Domain Name "1xslots-casino.in.net" was created. Based on those elements, the Panel is of the opinion that Respondent knew or should have known that the registration of the Disputed Domain Name would be confusingly similar to the 1XSLOTS trademarks.

Furthermore, the Complainant provided evidence showing that the Disputed Domain Name was set up by the Respondent to create a redirection to a website which offers non-authorized versions of Complainant's services with the purpose to mislead internet consumers who are attempting to acquire services through the Disputed Domain Name. In this sense, the Complainant has confirmed that no authorization was granted to the Respondent to register the Disputed Domain Name and no counterargument has been submitted by the Respondent. This is a clear indication that the Disputed Domain Name was set up with the only intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product.

Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com>

As above indicated, the Complainant filed the complaint against the Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com> based on the trademarks registered in February 2024 while the Disputed Domain Name was created on July 30, 2020; i.e. 4 years before the registration of the trademarks.

The UDRP doctrine is clear in the sense that only in exceptional cases would a complainant be able to prove a respondent's bad faith where a domain name has been registered before a Complainant has acquired trademark rights.

Those certain limited circumstances are mainly found where the facts of the case establish that the respondent's intent in registering the domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant's nascent (typically as yet unregistered) trademark rights. Such scenarios include registration of a domain name: (i) shortly before or after announcement of a corporate merger, (ii) further to the respondent's insider knowledge (e.g., a former employee), (iii) further to significant media attention (e.g., in connection with a product launch or prominent event), or (iv) following the complainant's filing of a trademark application.

To be able to assess whether this case can be considered as an exceptional one, the Complainant needs to show first of all that it had unregistered rights or common law trademark rights acquired by the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered.

In this regard, to establish unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the UDRP, the complainant must show that its mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the complainant's goods and/or services.

Relevant evidence demonstrating such acquired distinctiveness (also referred to as secondary meaning) includes a range of factors such as (i) the duration and nature of the use of the mark (which may include social media presence and engagement), (ii) the amount of sales under the mark and during which time period, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark – including evidence of expenditures over a relevant time period, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry such as trade and professional associations, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys. The fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant's mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the mark is used on the related website or impersonating documents or other instruments) may also support the complainant's assertion and evidence that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier.

See paragraphs 1.1.3 and 3.8.1 & 3.8.2. of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.

In order to support the claim, the Complainant provided the following evidence:

- The Complainant provided archived records from the Wayback Machine (available at: https://web.archive.org/web/20260000000000*/https://1xslot.com/en/), which are aimed to show the continuous activity of the <1xslot.com> website dating back to May 2019.
- Additionally, the Complainant provided with the following 4 screenshots: i) a waybackmachine's screenshot dated June 26, 2019 connected to the domain name 1xslot.com which displays content in Russian language, ii) a waybackmachine's screenshot dated December 25, 2019 connected to the domain name 1xslot.com which displays content in Portuguese language and where there are some mentions about the name 1XSLOTS, iii) a waybachmachine summary of a technical usage of the domain <1xslot.com> (i.e. MIME-types Count) and iv) a waybachmachine keys summary for the TLD/Host/Domain connected to <1xslot.com>URLs.
- Furthermore, the Complainant also provided screenshots of the official who is registered to the domain name <1xslots.com> - registered on April 6, 2019 and the domain name <1xslot.com> - registered on March 23, 2016.
- Finally, the Complainant also provided information about the Respondent SAROS DIGITAL SOLUTIONS LTD as the registrant for <1xslots-online.com> being involved as Respondents in UDRP cases involving the Complainant's trademark and other brands (e.g., CAC Case No. CAC-UDRP-107595; WIPO Case No. D2025-5398).

While the evidence at hand seems to be not enough in order to confer unregistered trademark rights to the Complainant for the purpose of this UDRP by the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, and, therefore, to provide with the required exception for the bad faith element, there are different elements which make the Panel believe that the Respondent might have had the Complainant in mind while registering the Disputed Domain Name; for instance:

- Usage of the Disputed Domain Name: the website connected to the Disputed Domain Name replicate the overall structure and the signature black-yellow-and-white color palette of the Complainant's official platforms, 1xslots.com and 1xslot.com. Furthermore, the official "1XSLOTS" trademarks are displayed in the Infringing Website in the exact same position (typically the

top-left corner) as on the official platforms, utilizing identical fonts, proportions, and UI/UX elements.
- CAC-UDRP-107595 where Respondent targeted Complainant with respect to the domain name 1xbet-az-play.com almost in the same pattern as in the current case.
- Registration and usage of Complainant's domain name com at least since 2019.

Based on those assumptions, the Panel has decided to use its general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules to conduct a limited online search regarding the internet usage of Complainant's trademark 1XSLOTS during the time the Disputed Domain Name's registration. In this regard, the Panel has been able to identify the following:

- Spanish news article dated September 2020 describing Complainant's business in Argentina under the brand „1XSLOTS"; https://www.unosantafe.com.ar/1xslot-argentina-por-que-lo-adoran-los-argentinos-n10154979.html
- Different reviews showing that Complainant's was established in 2017: https://sigma.world/play/online-casinos/1xslots/ & https://www.casinomeister.com/online-casinos/reviews/1xslots/

- Additional reviews connected to Complainant's business „1XSLOTS" showing interaction of Complainant with different users at least since 2019, https://www.askgamblers.com/online-casinos/reviews/1xslots-casino/5#reviews

In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, and based on the evidence and facts submitted by the Complainant, together with the Panel's own review, the Panel is prepared to conclude that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's mark. This conclusion is supported primarily by the manner in which the mark is used on the infringing website. The circumstances further confirm that the Complainant's mark had acquired significance as a source identifier by the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, and that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with the intention of unfairly capitalizing on the Complainant's nascent — though at that time potentially unregistered — trademark rights.

Furthermore, the Respondent used a privacy service in connection with the registration of Disputed Domain Name <1xslots-online.com>. In the absence of any Response, and taking into account the Respondent's conduct in relation to the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel considers it likely that the Respondent deliberately employed a privacy or proxy service to conceal its identity from an anticipated complainant or to avoid notification of a UDRP proceeding. The Panel therefore considers this circumstance to constitute an additional indication of bad faith.

A further relevant factor concerns the abuse reports and/or cease-and-desist ("C&D") letters sent by the Complainant to the Respondent(s). The Complaint includes evidence showing that a C&D letter was sent to the Respondents on April 3, 2026, to which no reply was received. The Respondent's failure to respond either to the Complainant's communications or to participate in the present proceedings further supports, when considered together with the other circumstances of the case, a finding of bad faith. See, for example, WIPO Case No. D2016-1695 concerning the domain name ibmresearchgroup.com, where the panel stated:

"The longstanding use of the IBM mark by Complainant is further evidence of the requisite bad faith insofar as such fact strongly suggests that Respondent was aware of Complainant's mark as of the time it registered the disputed domain name. Respondent's failure to respond to Complainant's 'cease and desist' letters is further evidence of bad faith."

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has previously been involved in at least two prior UDRP proceeding; i.e. UDRP CAC case Nr. 107595 and WIPO case Nr. D2025-5398 . Such prior conduct constitutes an additional factor supporting a finding of bad faith in the present case, as it suggests a pattern of abusive domain name registrations targeting the rights of trademark owners.

Having regard to the totality of the evidence and on the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are 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. **1xslots-online.com**: Transferred
2. **1xslots-casino.in.net**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Victor Garcia Padilla**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-11

Publish the Decision