Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108761

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108761
Time of filing	2026-06-22 16:03:25
Domain names	1x-bet-mx.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	MOKVEZA LTD

Complainant representative

Organization	Sindelka & Lachmannová advokáti s.r.o.

Respondent

Organization	Gollnow-Platzer

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 bases its Complaint, among others, on the following trademarks:

- European Union trade mark “1XBET”, no. 014227681, registered on 21 September 2015, for services in classes 35, 41, 42;
- European Union trade mark “1XBET”, no. 017517327, registered on 7 March 2018, for services in classes 41, 42;
- European Union trade mark “1XBET”, no. 017517384, registered on 7 March 2018, for services in classes 41, 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant belongs to the group of companies operating under the brand name 1xBET, which is an online gaming platform with worldwide reach (hereinafter also referred to as "1xBET"). 1xBET was founded in 2007 and it offers sports betting, lottery, bingo, live betting, lottery, being licensed by the government of Curacao.

1xBET is a recognized betting group companies, being nominated and winning multiple awards and prizes like SBC Awards, Global Gaming Awards, and International Gaming Awards.

1xBet is also an active sponsor of the top football tournaments like the official presenting partner of Italy´s Serie A, media partner of Spain´s La Liga, and is the sponsor of a number of big international tournaments such as the Africa Cup of Nations.

1xBET has developed a strong presence in the global online gambling market, as per the evidence filed by the Complainant in the file, for example, in July 2019, FC Barcelona announced that it had signed a partnership with 1xBet, naming the company as the team's new global partner.

In 2019, 1xBET became the FC Liverpool´s official global betting partner.

The Complainant owns the 1XBET trademarks cited above.

1xBET also operates a website under the domain name: <1xbet.com>, registered since 01 September 2006, which includes the Complainant's 1XBET trademark. 1xBET uses this domain name to resolve to its online betting websites.

The disputed domain name <1x-bet-mx.com> , registered on 28 August 2025, resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's 1XBET logo and relates to gambling.

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.

The Complainant's contentions are the following:

The disputed domain name <1x-bet-mx.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark 1XBET, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for a number of reasons and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

1. Confusing Similarity

The Panel agrees that the disputed domain name <1x-bet-mx.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark 1XBET, as the Complainant's trademark 1XBET is included in its entirety in the disputed domain name, separated by hyphens, with the addition of the term "mx", which might correspond to the geographical abbreviation of Mexico.

The addition of the term "mx" within the disputed domain name is not sufficient to escape the finding that such is confusingly similar to the Complainant's 1XBET trademark and it does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected

to the trademark 1XBET. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Moreover, the extension ".com" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name (WIPO Case No. D2005-0016, Accor v. Noldc Inc.). The mere adjunction of a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") such as ".com" is irrelevant as it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Case No. 2013-0820, L'Oréal v Tina Smith, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820 Titoni AG v Runxin Wang and WIPO Case No. D2009-0877, Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.).

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the first condition under the Policy is met.

2. Lack of Respondent's 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 burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name, as such is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name or by the terms "1x-bet-mx". The Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to make use of its trademark, nor of a confusingly similar trademark in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, based on the available evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any form.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name which incorporate entirely the Complainant's trademark 1XBET, with the addition of the term "mx", which might correspond to the geographical abbreviation of Mexico, resolves, as per the evidence filed by the Complainant, to a website displaying the Complainant's 1XBET logo, using a colour scheme identical to the Complainant's official branding, and relates to gambling, creating thus the impression of being affiliated with, authorised by, or endorsed by the Complainant in relation to its 1XBET brand, without disclosing in a clear and prominent manner the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

The above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Respondent had an opportunity to comment on the Complaint's allegations by filing a Response, which the Respondent failed to do.

Thus, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has at least established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel takes the view that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

3. Bad Faith

Based on the available evidence, the Complainant's 1XBET mark predates the registration date of the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark 1XBET entirely with the addition of the term "mx", which might correspond to the geographical abbreviation of Mexico, in order to create confusion with such trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's 1XBET trademark and has intentionally registered the disputed domain name in order to create confusion with such trademark.

In the present case, the following factors should be considered:

(i) the Complainant's 1XBET mark predates the registration date of the disputed domain name;

(ii) the Respondent failed to submit any response and has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name;

(iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark 1XBET entirely with the addition of the term "mx", which might correspond to the geographical abbreviation of Mexico;

(iv) the Respondent was not authorised to use a domain name similar to the Complainant's 1XBET trademark;

(v) the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's 1XBET logo, using a colour scheme identical to the Complainant's official branding, and relates to gambling, without disclosing in a clear and prominent manner the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Thus, also the third and last condition under the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **1x-bet-mx.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Delia-Mihaela Belciu**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-29

Publish the Decision