Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108614

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108614
Time of filing	2026-05-01 11:19:59
Domain names	bdlinebet.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Tonks Limited

Respondent

Name	Mr Pren Host

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.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

EU TM No. 018952911 LINEBET (Stylised) registered from 2 March 2024 for various services in classes 35, 41 and 42 including casino, gaming and gambling services.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complainant operates an online gambling services business that trades under the trademark LINEBET. It has provided its services through an online platform located at www.linebet.com since 2019, which provides services in approximately 62 languages and accepts over 100 payment methods. The online platform has over 13,132 user registrations in 2021 and in 2022 this figure increased to over 88,689. It has won a number of industry awards for its services and promotes it services through a number of social media accounts.

The complainant owns a number of trademark registrations containing the word LINEBET, including the above-mentioned EU registration.

The disputed domain name was registered on 29 May 2025 in the name of Mr Pren Host with an address in Bangladesh. It redirects to a website that purports to offer online betting services.

The Complainant asserts, and the Respondent does not dispute, that the letter "BD" is a country or geographical abbreviation indicating "Bangladesh".

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 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 UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Paragraph (4)(a) of the Policy lists three elements that the Complainant must prove to merit a finding that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent should be transferred to the Complainant:

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

2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

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

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements for the principal reasons set out below.

RIGHTS IN AN IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TRADEMARK

The Complainant has claimed registered rights over trade marks containing the words LINEBET. This includes the above-mentioned registration for a slightly stylised version of those words with a triangular underline in relation to various services in classes 35, 41 and 42 including casino, gaming and gambling services.

To satisfy paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy it is enough that the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has registered rights in a single trademark in a single jurisdiction that predates the registration of the disputed domain name (even if that single jurisdiction is not one in which the Respondent resides or operates) (Koninklijike KPN N.V. v. Telepathy, Inc D2001-0217 (WIPO 7 May 2001); see also WIPO Case Nos. D2012-0141 and D2011-1436).

Hence here registered rights in a stylised version of LINEBET are established.

The next question is whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to this stylised trademark.

Of first note, is the stylisation of the trademark is slight. It is not a graphically complex logo. The central feature of the trademark is the plain word LINEBET. The stylisation can be described as underlining in the form of a basic triangle.

Turning to the disputed domain name, it only differs from the word LINEBET mark in any material sense by reason of the inclusion of "bd" before "linebet". As noted above, the Complainant asserts, and the Respondent does not dispute, that "BD" is a country or geographical abbreviation indicating "Bangladesh". Further, Bangladesh is recorded as a country in which the Respondent resides.

The Panel accepts this argument. However, even if "BD" had no decipherable meaning then, nevertheless, these mere two letters do not detract from the distinctive "linebet". It is the "linebet" element that will be seen as the most significant brand indicator to a consumer.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to both the Complainant's above-mentioned registered trademark.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests (Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd. WIPO Case No. D2003-0455). Once such a prima facie case is made, the respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as having a name related to the disputed domain name. Past panels have held that a Respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent is not known as the owner of the disputed domain name. Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> (“Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as “Chad Moston / Elite Media Group.” The Panel therefore finds under Policy ¶ 4(c) (ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy ¶ 4(c) (ii).”).

There are no other facts that would indicate the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In such circumstances, the Complainant has made out its prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has no rights or interests in the disputed domain name.

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has established that it has a reputation in its LINEBET trademark to a sufficient degree that an internet user seeing that mark used in relation to online gambling services is likely to associate such services with the Complainant.

There is no apparent reason why the Respondent would adopt the disputed domain name and then use it to purport to offer the very same online gambling services that the Complainant has offered for a number of years under the LINEBET trademark other than to benefit from the Complainant's reputation. Namely, to benefit from confusion by internet users who are aware of this reputation and who then confuse the Respondent's services with those of the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of benefiting from confusion.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is 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. **bdlinebet.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrew Sykes**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-01

Publish the Decision