Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108782

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108782
Time of filing	2026-07-09 12:00:38
Domain names	1xbet-honduras.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	DIDIANE LTD

Respondent

Name	Denis Koziulin

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 “1XBET” trademarks, registered with WIPO in a number of jurisdictions (International Trademark Registration):

- Registration Number: 1817326A (word), Registration Date: September 3, 2024, Nice Classes: 35, 41, 42;

- Registration Number: 1673113A (figurative), Registration Date: May 2, 2022, Nice Classes: 35, 41, 42;

- Registration Number: 1673396A (figurative), Registration Date: May 2, 2022, Nice Classes: 35, 41, 42;

- Registration Number: 1673116A (figurative), Registration Date: May 2, 2022, Nice Classes: 35, 41, 42;

- Registration Number: 1673114A (figurative), Registration Date: May 2, 2022, Nice Classes: 35, 41, 42;

- Registration Number: 1672896A (figurative), Registration Date: April 6, 2022, Nice Classes: 41, 42;

- Registration Number: 1669925A (figurative), Registration Date: April 6, 2022, Nice Classes: 41, 42;

- Registration Number: 1379235 (figurative), Registration Date: July 21, 2017, Nice Classes: 35, 41, 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the proprietor of the 1XBET marks and forms part of the group operating an international online gaming and sports-betting platform under that brand. The record states that the 1XBET brand has been used since 2007 and that the group operates through <1xbet.com>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on 7 February 2025. It combines the Complainant's mark with a hyphen and the

geographical term “honduras”. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a Spanish-language website presenting itself as “1XBET Honduras”, displaying the Complainant's stylised 1XBET logo, and promoting account registration, a deposit bonus, a downloadable casino application, and real-money casino and betting services. The website does not disclose any relationship with the Complainant or identify an independent operator.

The Complainant states that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the 1XBET mark, that the Respondent is not affiliated with or licensed by the Complainant, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant states that the registration occurred almost eight years after the earliest trademark registration relied upon in the Complaint and approximately eighteen years after the asserted introduction of the 1XBET brand. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces the mark in full and adds only a geographical designation corresponding to the market addressed by the website. The website uses the same mark and stylised logo, presents itself as a Honduran 1XBET service, and promotes commercial betting and casino services of the kind offered under the Complainant's mark. It does so without identifying an independent operator or explaining that the website is unaffiliated with the Complainant. In addition, the Complainant states that the publicly available registration information was masked by a privacy service and the contact address used for the Complainant's transfer demand was not functional. The Complainant is of the view, that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and sought to attract Internet users through confusion with the 1XBET mark.

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

1. Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant's registered trademark rights satisfy the standing requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The mark 1XBET is reproduced in its entirety and remains clearly recognisable at the beginning of the Disputed Domain Name. The addition of a hyphen and the geographical term “honduras” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Where a mark remains recognisable, the addition of a geographical term ordinarily does not avoid confusing similarity (WIPO Overview 3.0, sections 1.7 and 1.8). The “.com” generic Top-Level Domain is a technical registration requirement and is disregarded in the comparison (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1).

The Panel therefore finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

2. Rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant must make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once it does so, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with evidence demonstrating such rights or legitimate interests; the ultimate burden of proof remains with the Complainant (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1).

The Complainant has established that it did not license or authorise the Respondent to use the 1XBET mark, that the Respondent is not affiliated with it, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. Nothing in the record points to trademark or other rights held by the Respondent.

Nor does the use shown in the record constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. The Disputed Domain Name has a strong risk of implied affiliation because it combines the mark with a country name in a form naturally suggestive of an official Honduran site. That implication is reinforced by the website's use of the Complainant's stylised logo, its first-person presentation as “1XBET Honduras”, and its promotion of the same category of commercial betting services, without a clear and prominent disclaimer or identification of an independent operator. Use designed to impersonate or falsely suggest affiliation with the trademark owner is not bona fide or fair (WIPO Overview 3.0, sections 2.5 and 2.5.1).

On this record, and in the absence of any rebuttal, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

3. Registration and use in bad faith

The circumstances show that the Respondent was aware of, and deliberately targeted, the Complainant and its 1XBET mark when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The mark is distinctive; the registration postdates the Complainant's 2017 trademark registration and the asserted use of the brand since 2007; the Disputed Domain Name combines the mark with a country name; and the corresponding website reproduces the Complainant's logo and offers services in the same commercial field. The Panel considers coincidence implausible.

The website's presentation is calculated to cause Internet users to believe that it is an official or authorised 1XBET website for Honduras. It promotes registration, bonuses, an application and real-money betting services. The Panel therefore finds that, by using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement. This is evidence of bad-faith registration and use within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The use of a privacy service and the reported failure of a pre-complaint email are not, standing alone, evidence of bad faith. In the present case, however, they do not displace the inference arising from the composition of the Disputed Domain Name and the impersonating commercial website. The Panel need not decide whether any other circumstance in paragraph 4(b) is present.

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The third element of paragraph 4(a) of 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. **1xbet-honduras.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jan Schnedler**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-05

Publish the Decision