Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108608

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108608**
Time of filing	**2026-05-06 17:46:24**
Domain names	**rocketplayslots.com**

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	**PULSUP LTD**

Respondent

Name	**Hlib Timko**

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 trademarks:

- Australian national trademark no. 2499913 (“ROCKET PLAY”), word + device, registered on 18 November 2024 for services in Class 41;
- Australian national trademark no. 2499915 (“ROCKET PLAY”), word + device, registered on 18 November 2024 for goods in Class 9; and
- Australian national trademark no. 2499916 (“ROCKET PLAY”), word + device, registered on 18 November 2024 for services in Class 42.

("**Complainant's Trademarks**")

The disputed domain name <rocketplayslots.com> was registered on 29 August 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As the Respondent did not file any response to the complaint, the Panel took into account the following facts asserted by the Complainant (and supported by the documentary evidence submitted by the Complainant) and unchallenged by the Respondent:

(a) Since 2020, the Complainant has operated the online casino platform ROCKETPLAY, available at <rocketplay.com> and widely known in the online gambling industry. Since its launch, ROCKETPLAY has gained substantial attention in the iGaming industry and among players. The platform offers real-money online gambling services, including slots, live dealer games, and tournaments, and is known for its bonus system, 24/7 support, and responsible gaming policies. ROCKETPLAY has been reviewed and recommended by respected third-party industry portals and comparison sites such as Casino Guru, AskGamblers, and Trustpilot;

(b) The Complainant is the owner of Complainant's Trademarks;

(c) The disputed domain name resolves to an active website that reproduces the design, layout, and visual identity of the Complainant's official rocketplay.com platform. The website presents itself under the brand name “RocketPlay Canada Casino,”

displays the Complainant's proprietary logo (favicon), and contains active calls-to-action and links which, when followed, redirect Internet users to a third-party online casino entirely unaffiliated with the Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

In addition to the above factual assertions, the Complainant also contends the following:

- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks as it incorporates the world element of Complainant's Trademarks (ROCKET PLAY) in its entirety, with the addition of the descriptive term “slots” appended at the end of the disputed domain name. It is well-established under the UDRP that the addition of a descriptive, generic, or industry-related term to a disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity;

- The Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name and has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not related in any way with the Complainant and the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant’s Trademarks, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant. The website operated under the disputed domain name reproduces the design and visual identity of the Complainant's official rocketplay.com platform, presents itself under the brand name “RocketPlay Canada Casino,” and displays the Complainant's proprietary logo (favicon). Such use of the disputed domain name certainly cannot establish Respondent's legitimate interest. As a result, the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- The Respondent's choice to register a domain name consisting of Complainant's Trademarks, paired with a term (“slots”) that designates a core service offered by the Complainant under such trademarks in the online gambling sector, cannot be explained by coincidence. It reflects a deliberate decision to exploit the recognition and goodwill associated with the ROCKETPLAY brand and to mislead Internet users who associate the term “slots” with the Complainant's gaming offerings. The website at www.rocketplayslots.com reproduces the design and visual identity of the Complainant's official rocketplay.com platform, presents itself under the brand name “RocketPlay Canada Casino,” and displays the Complainant's proprietary logo (favicon). The Respondent deliberately registered and used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's services and Complainant's Trademarks. Therefore, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent did not provide any response to the complaint.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s Trademarks within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("**UDRP**" or "**Policy**") (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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 requires that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or revoked:

(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 will proceed to analyse whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in these proceedings.

RIGHTS

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks. It contains the distinctive word element of Complainant's Trademarks "ROCKET PLAY" in its entirety. Addition of other descriptive and/or non-distinctive elements such as "slots" is not sufficient to diminish confusing similarity of disputed domain name to Complainant's Trademarks.

For sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. the ".com") must be disregarded under the identity / confusing similarity test as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

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

As asserted by the Complainant (and unchallenged by the Respondent), the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Neither is the Respondent in any way related to the Complainant. The Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy). Moreover, the Respondent operates a website under the disputed domain name which advertises services similar to those of the Complainant (online gambling services) and layout of such website is confusingly similar to that of the Complainant, including unauthorized use of Complainant's logo (favicon) which forms part of Complainant's Trademarks. Such use certainly cannot establish rights or legitimate interest of the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel concludes 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 Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Respondent operates a website under the disputed domain name which advertises services similar to those of the Complainant (online gambling services) and layout of such website is confusingly similar to that of the Complainant (including unauthorized use of Complainant's logo (favicon) which forms part of Complainant's Trademarks. This clearly shows bad faith of the Respondent in registration and use of the disputed domain name as the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's web site by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademarks as to the services on the Respondent's website. Such conduct is one of the model cases of bad faith in registration and use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As a result, the Panel found that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used by the Respondent 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. **rocketplayslots.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Michal Matějka**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-13

Publish the Decision