



**CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE**  
**DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL**  
**DECISION**

CIIDRC case number:	25759-UDRP	Decision date: December 18, 2025
Disputed Domain Names:	<betmaster-gr.com>; <betmasterplay.net>; <betmaster-es.com>	
Registrar:	<b>OnlineNIC, Inc.</b>	
Panel:	<b>Douglas M. Isenberg</b>	
Complainant:	<b>BMGate Ltd., former Reinvent Ltd.</b>	
Respondent:	<b>Thierry Jean Felix Martinez</b>	

## 1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The procedural history of this case was set out in a letter from the Canadian International Internet Dispute Resolution Centre ("CIIDRC") to the Panel:

1. On October 9, 2025, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via online platform. The required fee was paid on November 6, 2025.
2. On November 7, 2025, CIIDRC transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name; the Registrar responded advising of the identity of the Respondent and providing the above contact details. In addition, the Registrar confirmed that the disputed domain name was placed in a Registrar LOCK.
3. On November 13, 2025, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.
4. On November 13, 2025, pursuant to UDRP Rule 4 and Supplemental Rule 5, CIIDRC notified the Respondent of this administrative proceeding and forwarded a Notice of Complaint to the Respondent.

5. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for December 3, 2025.
6. The Respondent has failed to file its response.
7. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single-member.

On December 15, 2025, CIIDRC appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as panelist.

The Domain Names were registered on January 3, 2023 (<betmaster-gr.com>); August 3, 2022 (<betmasterplay.net>); and January 5, 2023 (<betnaster-es.com>).

## **2. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES**

Complainant states that it is “an international company developing innovative technological solutions, products, and services in areas such as the finance, gaming and betting industries”; that “[o]ne of the products the Complainant has designed and produced is Betmaster sports betting and gambling site,” which is “an international brand that provides legal online sports betting and casino services to end-customers who meet the legal age requirements, operating in regulated markets across Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Complainant states, and provides documentation to support, that it<sup>1</sup> is the owner of the following trademark registrations:<sup>2</sup>

- U.S. Reg. No. 6,138,343 for BETMASTER (registered September 1, 2020) for use in connection with, *inter alia*, “betting services”
- EU Reg. No. 016577736 for BETMASTER (registered on January 15, 2018) for use in connection with, *inter alia*, “betting services”
- Italy Reg. No. 2015000057307 for BETMASTER (registered June 20, 2017) for use in connection with, *inter alia*, “betting services”

The registrations listed above are referred to herein as the “BETMASTER Trademark.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Complainant states: “BMGate Ltd, previously known as Reinvent Ltd, has undergone a name change but was not yet able to inform the trademark offices of the name change. Therefore, trademark certificates attached as annexes may mention Reinvent Ltd as the owner of the trademarks instead of BMGate Ltd. However, these entities are the same, and their names should be treated interchangeably.” In support thereof, Complainant has provided a Certificate of Change of Name in Cyprus.

<sup>2</sup> Complainant appears to have provided, in some instances, trademark application serial numbers (instead of registration numbers) and filing dates (instead of registration dates). Although it is impossible to ascertain whether the inaccurate information was careless or inadvertent, the Panel has confirmed the correct details. “Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated *inter alia* in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.” WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“WIPO Overview 3.0”), section 4.8

Complainant states, and provides screenshots in support thereof, that each of the Disputed Domain Names is used in connection with a website for services that “are identical to the services offered by the Complainant.”

### 3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

Complainant contends that:

- Each of the Disputed Domain Names is confusingly similar to the BETMASTER Trademark because each of them contains the BETMASTER Trademark in its entirety, and the additional elements do nothing to prevent confusing similarity.
- Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names because, *inter alia*, “the Respondent has made no claims to having any relevant prior rights to use the trademark ‘Betmaster’”; “Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use any of its trademarks in any form, including in domain names”; “Respondent is not sponsored by, or legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant in any way”; and “[t]he Respondent has not demonstrated that the Disputed Domain Names will be used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, particularly considering that the Complainant’s trademark is used in the Disputed Domain Names in its entirety and that the services offered by the Respondent on the Disputed Domain Names are identical to the services offered by the Complainant.”
- The Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith because, *inter alia*, “[t]he fact that the Complainant’s trademarks predates the registration dates of the Disputed Domain Names demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration”; “[t]he Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Names in a manner that is likely to cause confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Disputed Domain Names, apparently with the intent to divert potential consumers looking for the Complainant’s website and instead to direct such consumers to the Respondent’s websites through redirect functionality made available on the Disputed Domain Names”; “[t]he services offered on the Disputed Domain Names are similar to those of the Complainant, leading to consumer confusion, as users are misled into believing the websites are operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant”; and “when clicking on any interactive content on the Disputed Domain Names, users are redirected to websites of other casino operators – direct competitors of the Complainant.”
- **Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the Domain Names be transferred to it.

## 4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

### 4.1 Requirements

In accordance with Paragraph 4 of the UDRP, the onus is on the Complainant to prove that:

1. the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and
3. the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

### 4.2 Analysis

#### 4.2.1 The Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights

Based upon the trademark registrations cited by the Complainant, it is apparent that the Complainant has rights in and to the BETMASTER Trademark.

As to whether the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the BETMASTER Trademark, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Names only (i.e., “betmaster-gr,” “betmasterplay” and “betmaster-es”) because “[t]he applicable Top-Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test”. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

As set forth in section 1.7 of WIPO Overview 3.0: “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing.” Here, each of the Disputed Domain Names incorporates the entirety of the BETMASTER Trademark.

Further, as set forth in section 1.8 of WIPO Overview 3.0: “Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.” Here, the letters “gr” (an abbreviation for Greece) and “es” (an abbreviation for Spain) are geographical terms, and

the word “play” is a descriptive term, none of which prevents a finding of confusing similarity. Further, of course, inclusion of a hyphen in one of the Disputed Domain Names is irrelevant for purposes of the UDRP, “the insertion of a hyphen... [is] not [a] relevantly distinguishing feature[].” *Western Union Holdings, Inc. v. Anna Valdieri*, WIPO Case No. D2006-0884.

The Panel finds the first element of the UDRP has been established.

#### **4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name**

The Complainant has argued that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, *inter alia*, “the Respondent has made no claims to having any relevant prior rights to use the trademark ‘Betmaster’”; “Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use any of its trademarks in any form, including in domain names”; “Respondent is not sponsored by, or legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant in any way”; and “[t]he Respondent has not demonstrated that the Disputed Domain Names will be used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, particularly considering that the Complainant’s trademark is used in the Disputed Domain Names in its entirety and that the services offered by the Respondent on the Disputed Domain Names are identical to the services offered by the Complainant.”

WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1, states: “[w]hile the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of ‘proving a negative’, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its *prima facie* case and without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the UDRP.

#### **4.2.3 Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith**

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the UDRP may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in the UDRP: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has

registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the registrant's website or location or of a product or service on the registrant's website or location. UDRP, paragraph 4(b).

Here, the Panel agrees with Complainant that Respondent's use of the /Disputed Domain Names in connection with websites offering the same services associated with the BETMASTER Trademark constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP. See, e.g., *Arla Foods amba v. Jucco Holdings*, WIPO Case No. D2006-0409 ("the practice of registering a domain name and using it to redirect a user to a website which is used for the sale of competing services constitutes evidence of registering and using a trademark in bad faith"); and *Six Continents Hotels, Inc., v. Bunjong Chaiviriyawong*, WIPO Case No. D2013-1942 (by using disputed domain name in connection with a website that "offers... services in competition with the Complainant... the Respondent, by such use, intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, expecting to reach the website corresponding to the Complainant's services and to obtain information about the Complainant's activity, to services related to another [company], by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and business, and damaging the Complainant's business").

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the UDRP.

## 5 DECISION and ORDER

For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the UDRP, Paragraph 15 of the Rules, and Rule 10 of the Supplemental Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <betmaster-gr.com>, <betmasterplay.net> and <betmaster-es.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of December 18, 2025.

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

