Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108606

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108606
Time of filing	2026-04-27 15:32:02
Domain names	paripesabet.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ALBUS LTD

Respondent

Name	danilo beccaria

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

The Complainant is the owner of the following "PARIPESA" trademarks:

Jurisdiction	Trademark	Registration No.	Filing Date	Registration Date	Class(es)
European Union	PARIPESA	018287084	August 12, 2020	December 10, 2020	41, 42
South Africa	PARIPESA	2020/26796	October 6, 2020	Duly registered	41
South Africa	PARIPESA	2020/27376	October 6, 2020	Duly registered	42

The trademark was originally registered by Vezzali Limited (Cyprus) and was transferred in its entirety to the Complainant by total transfer recorded on September 9, 2024.

The Complainant also asserts rights in the domain names <paripesa.com> and <paripesa.org>, both of which have been used in connection with its online sports betting and gaming platform.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a company incorporated under the laws of the Republic of Seychelles.

It operates an online sports betting, casino gaming, and digital entertainment platform under the “PARIPESA” brand. The platform was founded in 2019. The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the platform has grown substantially since its inception, attracting over one million registered users worldwide by the end of 2022, and that it operates across markets in Africa, Latin America, Asia and Europe.

The disputed domain name <paripesabet.com> was registered on May 15, 2021.

The Complainant filed its first abuse complaint to the Registrar on January 28, 2026.

The Complaint under these proceedings was filed on April 27, 2026, approximately five years after the registration of the disputed domain name.

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).

The Complainant has established rights in the “PARIPESA” mark through its trademark registrations, all of which pre-date the registration of the disputed domain name.

The test for determining confusing similarity is a relatively straightforward exercise. Essentially, the approach is to conduct a side-by-side comparison with the disputed domain name. See F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. P Martin, WIPO Case No. D2009-0323; WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

It is also well established that a domain name which wholly incorporates a complainant's registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for UDRP purposes. See WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasiliy Terkin.

Here, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's “PARIPESA” trademark in its entirety, together with the term "bet". The “PARIPESA” trademark is clearly recognisable as the dominant element of the disputed domain name.

Far from dispelling confusing similarity, the addition of the term "bet" reinforces it. The word "bet" is a direct descriptor of the Complainant's principal service, namely online sports betting. An internet user encountering the disputed domain name would reasonably understand it to refer to the Complainant's betting platform or an authorised associated service. The addition of a descriptive term that relates directly to the Complainant's core business is not sufficient to dispel confusing similarity. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

The addition of the gTLD ".com" does not add any distinctiveness to the disputed domain name and is disregarded for the purposes of this element. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel considers that this ground is made out.

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).

A complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, after which the burden shifts to the respondent to demonstrate such rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to discharge this burden, paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied. See Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd, WIPO Case No. D2003-0455; Document Technologies, Inc. v. International Electronic Communications Inc., WIPO Case No. D2000-0270; Europay International S. A. v. Eurocard.com, WIPO Case No. D2000-0173; Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web, WIPO Case No. D2000-0624.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for several reasons, which the Panel accepts.

First, the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has received no consent, permission, or authorisation to use the “PARIPESA” trademark in connection with the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent holds any

trademark rights in, or is commonly known by, the disputed domain name or the name “PARIPESA”.

Secondly, the evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name was used to display the “PARIPESA” trademark and branding without authorisation, in a manner that creates the impression of an official or affiliated betting platform. Such use is not consistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Thirdly, the evidence also shows that the disputed domain name was subsequently used to redirect visitors to a competing online betting service via an affiliate link. Commercial redirection of this kind, deploying the Complainant's trademark to attract users and then diverting them to a rival platform for financial gain, is not consistent with any recognised basis for legitimate interests in the domain name.

Fourthly, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the name "PARIPESA" or "PARIPESABET" nor does it own any trademark rights.

The Respondent has not filed any administratively compliant response and has, therefore, not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case or advanced any basis on which rights or legitimate interests might be found.

Accordingly, the Panel finds this ground made out.

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).

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if present, constitute evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith, including where a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the “PARIPESA” brand has attracted a substantial user base since the platform commenced operations in 2019, and by the date of registration of the disputed domain name in May, 2021, the “PARIPESA” trademark had been a registered European Union trade mark for more than five months and the platform was actively in operation and available online.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 15, 2021, after the “PARIPESA” trademark had been registered. The disputed domain name incorporates the “PARIPESA” trademark in its entirety together with the word "bet", which is a direct descriptor of the Complainant's online sports betting services.

The deliberate combination of the Complainant's "PARIPESA" trademark with a term that immediately and specifically describes the Complainant's business is strong evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark and services at the time of registration.

This inference is reinforced by the evidence that within approximately five weeks of registration, the disputed domain name was already displaying the “PARIPESA” trademark and branding together with promotional material. There is no plausible explanation for this immediate and targeted use that is consistent with the Respondent having registered the domain name in good faith. The Panel considers it likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's “PARIPESA” trademark and its use in connection with online sports betting when registering the disputed domain name.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant establishes, without any evidence adduced to the contrary, a sustained and continuing course of bad faith use. In one phase of use, commencing from at least June 19, 2021, the disputed domain name was used to display “PARIPESA” branding, review content and promotional material in a manner consistent with impersonating or presenting as affiliated with the Complainant's betting platform, thereby attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation or endorsement.

In a subsequent phase, the disputed domain name was used to redirect visitors to a competing online betting service via an affiliate link, by which the Respondent sought to commercially exploit the Complainant's trademark to divert traffic to a rival platform.

The conduct in both phases falls squarely within the circumstances described in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not filed any administratively compliant response and has advanced no explanation or justification for any of these uses of the disputed domain name. There is, therefore, no evidence of any conceivable good-faith purpose at any stage of its use.

One matter which somewhat weighed upon the Panel’s decision is the period of approximately five years between the registration of the disputed domain name in May 2021 and the filing of the Complaint in April 2026.

The UDRP does not impose any limitation period on the filing of a complaint and does not recognise a formal laches defence. The WIPO Overview 3.0, section 4.17, records that panels have declined to adopt concepts such as laches or its equivalent in UDRP

cases, observing that the UDRP remedy is essentially injunctive rather than compensatory. The same section acknowledges, however, that in specific cases, delay in filing a complaint may make it more difficult for a complainant to establish its case on the merits, particularly where a respondent can show detrimental reliance on the delay.

Here, the apparent delay is inferentially explained by the corporate succession in the ownership of the "PARIPESA" trademark albeit that the Panel had to ascertain this from the materials submitted. The evidence, therefore, shows that the "PARIPESA" trademark was originally registered by and held in the name of Vezzali Limited, the Cyprus-incorporated original operator of the platform. The "PARIPESA" trademark was transferred in its entirety to the Complainant on September 9, 2024. The Complaint was filed on April 27, 2026, approximately eighteen months after the Complainant became the registered proprietor of the "PARIPESA" trademark.

While a five year delay in bringing action may constitute an inexcusable delay especially without any detailed explanation, the Panel does not regard a period of eighteen months between the assumption of trademark ownership and the filing of a UDRP complaint, in circumstances where the disputed domain name has been, arguably, in continuous bad faith use, as indicative of acquiescence or otherwise inconsistent with a genuine assertion of trademark rights.

The Respondent has filed no response and has raised no argument of detrimental reliance on any period of inaction. Accordingly, the Panel can only infer that the registration and use of the disputed domain name have been in bad faith.

The Panel takes this opportunity, however, to observe that where a significant period has elapsed between the registration of a disputed domain name and the filing of a UDRP complaint, a complainant carries a responsibility to address the circumstances of that delay in its complaint. This obligation is not merely procedural; it goes to the discharge of the complainant's burden of proof on the third element.

The absence of any explanation for an apparent delay may, in a closer case, weigh against a finding of bad faith, especially where it raises a question of acquiescence in the respondent's use of the disputed domain name.

Here, while the Complainant has not addressed the delay directly in its Complaint, the explanation is apparent from the evidence of the trademark succession. Complainants who find themselves in comparable circumstances should address the reasons for the delay directly in their Complaint.

Given the evidence adduced of the Complainant's rights arising from its trademark registrations and the unchallenged sustained bad faith use of the disputed domain name from an early stage, the Panel is satisfied 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 Panel finds this ground made out.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Notification of proceedings to the Respondent

When forwarding a Complaint, including any annexes, electronically to the Respondent, paragraph 2 of the Rules states that the CAC shall employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent.

Paragraphs 2(a)(i) to (iii) set out the sort of measures to be employed to discharge the CAC's responsibility to achieve actual notice to the Respondent.

On May 26, 2026, the CAC by its non-standard communication stated as follows (omitting irrelevant parts):

"Please be aware that the CAC was not able to send the written notice to the Respondent as the address provided by the Registrar in Registrar verification does not exist. The postal service provider was not able to deliver a written notice to such an address.

No other address for correspondence was found on the disputed domain name.

As far as the e-mail notice is concerned, we received a confirmation that the e-mail notice sent to postmaster@paripesabet.com was returned back non-delivered as the e-mail address had permanent fatal errors.

The e-mail notice was also sent to info@100click.com, but we never received any proof of delivery or notification of non-delivery.

No further e-mail address could be found on the disputed site.

The Respondent never accessed the online platform."

Given the reasonable measures employed by the CAC as set out in the above non-standard communication, the Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Complainant is the owner of the “PARIPESA” trademark, as well as the domain names <paripesa.com> and <paripesa.org>, which are used in connection with its online sports betting and gaming platform.

The disputed domain name <paripesabet.com> was registered on May 15, 2021, after the Complainant's predecessor in title had established trademark rights in the “PARIPESA” mark, and the disputed domain name has been used in a manner that trades upon those rights.

The Complainant challenges the registration of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a) of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, seeking transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent failed to file any administratively compliant response.

For the reasons articulated in the Panel's findings above, the Panel is satisfied that:

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's “PARIPESA” trademark;

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.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **paripesabet.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**William Lye OAM KC**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-04

Publish the Decision