Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109043

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109043
Time of filing	2026-10-16 10:59:57
Domain names	melbetcasino.pro

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BATNESTO LTD

Respondent

Name	Tom Webb

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 owns several trademarks consisting of the word Melbot in several countries, among them the European Union trademark 019060714 MELBET in classes 9,16,21,25,28,30 registered since November 11, 2024, and in effect.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

MELBET is a globally active sportsbook brand established in 2012. Complainant operates with licensees in over 40 markets, with over 100,000 partners and more than 1 million active players.

MELBET has a substantial international presence, including multilingual website content, a large user base, and participation in advertising activities involving sports teams, athletes, and industry events.

The brand has built a strong reputation through sponsorships with global icons and organizations, including Juventus FC, Chennaiyin FC, Yangon United FC, football legends Didier Drogba and Andrés Iniesta, cricket icon Faf du Plessis, and basketball player Ray Parks, Jr .

The disputed domain name has been registered on November 5, 2026 and resolves to a website showing the MELBET trademark advertising casino services. Initially, Repondent´s name was shown in the registry database as „Withheld for Privacy LLC“.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant states, inter alia, that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark since they are fully incorporated in the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name <**melbetcasino.pro**> and he is not related in any way to the Complainant and is not known as „melbetcasino.pro“.

The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with, the Respondent. The Complainant contends that in view of the dominant online presence of the MELBET trademarks and the reproduction of the MELBET trademarks, registration and use in bad faith is evidenced.

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

In order to succeed in its claim, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy

have been satisfied:

(i) The 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 with respect to the domain name; and

(iii) The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for „MELBET“.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant´s trademark since the modifications in the disputed domain name, the addition of the descriptive element „casino“ does not influence the overall character of the disputed domain name compared to

the trademark of the Complainant. Also, the trademark is fully incorporated in the disputed domain name. The TLD „Pro“ is not considered as having an influence on the similarity of the SLD, here „Melbetcasino“.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks or designations confusingly similar to its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “melbetcasino.pro” or that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In view of the online presence of the Complainant, its business success, the full incorporation of the trademark of the Complainant as well as the reproduction of Complainant´s trademark on the website under the disputed domain name, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to make use of a designation that is highly similar to its marks. This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular domain name without the Complainant's authorization.

The circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name primarily with the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its potential website or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or location, or of a product or service on such website or location.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with 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. **melbetcasino.pro**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dietrich Beier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-18

Publish the Decision