Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108714

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108714
Time of filing	2026-06-29 09:36:05
Domain names	rocketplaycasino-online.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	PULSUP LTD

Respondent

Name	Vadim Crudu

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 several registered trademarks for a figurative mark consisting of the capitalized words ROCKET PLAY in white on a black background alongside a representation of a yellow playing card symbol (club) inset with the image of a rocket, including, for example:

Australian Registered Trade Mark Number 2499913, registered with effect from November 18, 2024 in Class 41; and

European Union Registered Trade Mark Number 18992626, registered on November 7, 2025, in Class 41.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Cyprus, which has, since 2020, 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 and has been the recipient of numerous industry awards, many based on a public vote, for its online casino offering.

The ROCKETPLAY brand is positively rated on key consumer platforms such as Trustpilot, Casino Guru and Ask Gamblers. The said brand enjoys a strong reputation among consumers, with users accessing the Complainant's platform via <rocketplay.com> and affiliate networks.

The Complainant is the copyright owner of the official ROCKETPLAY brandbook and website design, registered with the United States of America Copyright Office under number Txu 2-386-573 on July 27, 2023. This protects the logo, typography, layout, color scheme, and design assets used by the Complainant since 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 2, 2025, approximately nine and a half months after the Complainant registered the ROCKETPLAY trademark in Australia on November 18, 2024, and approximately five years after the Complainant began using the ROCKETPLAY mark in 2020 and acquired substantial goodwill, including industry awards and thousands of positive reviews.

The website at the disputed domain name reproduces the complete visual design, layout, and branding of the Complainant's official <rocketplay.com> platform, including the Complainant's logo and favicon, and presents itself throughout under the ROCKETPLAY brand. Active buttons and calls-to-action on the said website redirect Internet users not to any service of the Complainant, but to third-party online casinos unaffiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant notes (but does not produce evidence showing) that the said website contains a disclaimer in the footer stating: "Copyright © 2026. This website provides independent reviews and is not affiliated with RocketPlay Casino or its operators."

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ROCKETPLAY trademark in which the Complainant holds rights and incorporates the Complainant's ROCKETPLAY trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the terms "casino" and "online" separated by a hyphen. The dominant element ROCKETPLAY is reproduced in its entirety and is clearly recognizable as the leading component of the disputed domain name. The surrounding terms "casino" and "online" serve only to reinforce the association with the Complainant's business, suggesting an official online casino platform operated under the Complainant's ROCKETPLAY mark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that it has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the ROCKETPLAY mark, or any variation thereof, in a domain name or otherwise. The Complainant adds that there is no business relationship or affiliation between the Parties.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name was registered approximately nine and a half months after the Complainant registered the ROCKETPLAY trademark in Australia and approximately five years after the Complainant began using the ROCKETPLAY mark and acquired substantial goodwill, including industry awards and thousands of positive reviews. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's entire distinctive mark together with the terms "casino" and "online", both of which are directly descriptive of the Complainant's principal commercial activity, and which have no independent meaning capable of identifying any other source.

Further, the Complainant notes that there is no evidence, in the WhoIs record, public filings, or otherwise, that the Respondent is commonly known by "RocketPlay", "RocketPlayCasino", "RocketPlayCasinoOnline", or any related variation.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an active website that reproduces the complete visual design, layout, and branding identity of the Complainant's official <rocketplay.com> platform, including the Complainant's logo and favicon. The said website presents itself under the ROCKETPLAY brand throughout its headers, navigation, titles, and editorial content, and deploys the Complainant's brand assets without authorization. The Complainant states that the active buttons and calls-to-action on the said website redirect Internet users to third-party online casinos entirely unaffiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant contends that this conduct does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant further contends that the disclaimer contained in the said website's footer does not establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and does not negate the finding of bad faith, but rather is an admission by the Respondent that Internet users are likely to be confused by the said website into believing it is affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, as this consists of the Complainant's trademark plus additional terms that are directly descriptive of the Complainant's own services. The Complainant notes that such composition cannot constitute fair use where it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, particularly where the website operated under the disputed domain name does not merely suggest sponsorship or endorsement, but rather actively impersonates the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant's logo, favicon, and complete visual design, and deploys the ROCKETPLAY mark throughout its content.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, it contends that the Respondent's choice to register a domain name consisting of the Complainant's exact and distinctive trademark paired with the terms "casino" and "online", which directly describe the Complainant's principal commercial activity, cannot be explained by coincidence. Rather it reflects a deliberate decision to exploit the recognition and goodwill associated with the ROCKETPLAY brand and to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name corresponds to an official, current, or authorized online casino service of the Complainant. The Respondent's intent to exploit the Complainant's mark is confirmed by the website operated under the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's logo, favicon, and complete visual identity, and deploys the ROCKETPLAY brand throughout.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's conduct satisfies every element of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, noting that the composition of the disputed domain name itself, together with the reproduction of the Complainant's complete visual design and layout throughout the website, creates the false impression that the disputed domain name is an official web presence of the ROCKETPLAY platform and demonstrates that the Respondent has constructed a deceptive replica of the Complainant's online

identity for the purpose of generating affiliate or referral revenue from traffic generated by the Complainant's brand recognition.

The Complainant further contends that the registrant identity of the disputed domain name is redacted for privacy, that all registrant and contact details have been withheld, and that the underlying registrant identity is concealed. It contends that, while the use of a privacy service is not, in itself, dispositive of bad faith, when combined with the deliberate selection of a domain name incorporating the Complainant's mark and service-descriptive terms, after the Complainant's mark became well known, and with the confirmed reproduction of the Complainant's logo, favicon, and complete visual design, this constitutes an additional factor evidencing bad faith.

Respondent:

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

With regard to the first element of the Policy, the Complainant has demonstrated to the Panel's satisfaction that it has UDRP-relevant rights in its ROCKET PLAY trademarks by virtue of the registered trademarks noted above. The Complainant's trademarks are figurative in nature but the word elements (which are the only parts that could be compared with a domain name, since domain names are alphanumeric and do not contain graphical elements) are readily severable from the graphic design aspects for comparison purposes (see the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.10).

The disputed domain name consists of the textual elements of the Complainant's trademarks, absent the included space, coupled with the descriptive expression "casino-online" and the domain name suffix ".com". The absent space is of no significance, given that spaces cannot be included in domain names for technical reasons. Likewise, the presence of additional words in the disputed domain name does not mean that the Complainant's mark is not recognizable therein.

It should be noted that, according to the Complainant and not denied by the Respondent, the website associated with the disputed domain name has been used for a cloned version of the Complainant's official website. While the content of the website associated with the domain name concerned is usually disregarded by panels when assessing confusing similarity under the first element, in some instances, panels have taken note of such content to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.15).

The domain name suffix can be disregarded for the purposes of the comparison exercise (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1). Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ROCKET PLAY trademark.

With regard to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that it has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the ROCKETPLAY mark, or any variation thereof, in a domain name or otherwise, that there is no business relationship or affiliation between the Parties, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by "RocketPlay" or any

related variation. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name was registered approximately nine and a half months after the Complainant registered its trademark in Australia and approximately five years after the Complainant began using the ROCKETPLAY mark and acquired substantial goodwill, including industry awards and thousands of positive reviews. The Complainant adds that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's entire distinctive mark together with the terms "casino" and "online", both of which are directly descriptive of the Complainant's principal commercial activity, and which have no independent meaning capable of identifying any other source.

The Complainant also notes that the website at the disputed domain name reproduces the complete visual design, layout, and branding of the Complainant's official platform, including the Complainant's logo and favicon, and presents itself throughout under the Complainant's brand, although active buttons and calls-to-action on the website redirect Internet users not to any service of the Complainant, but to third-party online casinos unaffiliated with the Complainant.

The Panel is satisfied that these submissions give rise to the requisite prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The use of the website associated with the disputed domain name for a site that reproduces the Complainant's official website could not confer any rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent and would not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name (according to a review of the corresponding domain name registration information). Furthermore, as the website associated with the disputed domain name is commercial in nature, it could not be argued that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's allegations and evidence in this case and has failed to set out any alleged rights or legitimate interests which it might have claimed in the disputed domain name. There are no submissions or evidence on the record which might serve to rebut the Complainant's case on this topic, as outlined above. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. By the date of registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant's Australian trademark registration was established. The Respondent appears to deliberately reference the Complainant's mark on the website associated with the disputed domain name by way of reproducing a cloned version of the Complainant's site which features the complete visual design, layout, and branding of the Complainant's official platform, including the Complainant's logo and favicon, and presents itself throughout under the Complainant's trademark. It is reasonable, both in these circumstances and in the absence of any countervailing submissions or evidence, to infer that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent with an awareness of the Complainant and its rights, and with an intent to target these. In terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, 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 as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website.

The Panel notes that the Complainant states that there is a disclaimer in the footer of the website associated with the disputed domain name stating that said site provides independent reviews and is not affiliated with RocketPlay Casino or its operators, though the screenshots provided to the Panel do not show said disclaimer. The Panel is nonetheless satisfied that such a disclaimer would demonstrate that the Respondent had prior knowledge of the Complainant and its mark, and, given that the overall circumstances point to the Respondent's bad faith, the use of such a disclaimer cannot cure this. On the contrary, it amounts to an admission on the Respondent's part that Internet users may be confused. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.7.

Consequently, the Panel considers that the Complainant has made out a sufficient case of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy. The Respondent has not filed a Response in this case and therefore has not sought to address the Complainant's allegations of bad faith registration and use or to contradict in any way the evidence that the Complainant has presented. The Respondent has not offered any explanation that might have suggested that its actions regarding the disputed domain name were in good faith, and the Panel has been unable to identify any conceivable good faith explanation which the Respondent might have put forward in the present case. In all of these circumstances, the Panel finds that 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. **rocketplaycasino-online.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrew Lothian**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-27

Publish the Decision