



## CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

### DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	25912-UDRP	Decision date: 22 December, 2025
Domain Name(s):	<betmastermexico.com>	
Panel:	<b>Rodolfo C. Rivas</b>	
Complainant:	<b>BMGate Ltd., former Reinvent Ltd.</b>	
Respondent:	<b>Andrey Mogilnickiy</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" or "the Center") to the Panel:

On October 30, 2025, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via online platform. The required fee was paid on November 18, 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.

The Complainant decided not to amend the Complaint.

On November 27, 2025, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.

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.

The deadline for submitting a Response was set for December 17, 2025.

The Respondent has failed to file its Response.

The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single-member.

In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC hereby appointed Rodolfo C. Rivas, the undersigned, as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter. The undersigned completed and returned the statement of acceptance and declaration of impartiality and independence to CIIDRC, in order to serve in the above-mentioned matter.

Absent exceptional circumstances, and pursuant to Rule 15 (b), the decision is due by January 8, 2026. CIIDRC will communicate the full text of the decision to the parties and the concerned Registrar.

The Domain Name was registered on 2025-07-09.

This matter is conducted pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Policy) and the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Rules) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

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

BMGate Ltd, previously known as Reinvent Ltd, has undergone a name change but has not yet been able to inform the trademark offices of the change. Therefore, the trademark certificates attached as annexes may list Reinvent Ltd as the owner of the trademarks rather than BMGate Ltd. However, these entities are the same, and their names should be treated interchangeably.

BMGate Ltd (from hereinafter 'the Complainant') is an international company developing innovative technological solutions, products, and services in areas such as the finance, gaming, and betting industries.

One of the products the Complainant has designed and produced is the Betmaster sports betting and gambling site. The "Betmaster" brand is an international provider of 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.

The Complainant has also created and published an application on the Apple App Store titled 'Betmaster – Sports Betting', which has already accumulated a significant number of downloads within a short period of time.

The Complainant has invested significant effort and financial resources to obtain gaming licenses and permits.

The Complainant's "Betmaster" trademark has an online presence. Online resources include reviews and articles from specialized websites across various countries. As a result of this reputation, the "Betmaster" trademark has positioned itself as a reliable source of entertainment for people around the world.

In short, the Complainant has obtained trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions for the "Betmaster" trademark.

So, any misuse of the "Betmaster" trademark negatively impacts the Complainant's products and services and causes substantial financial and reputational harm to the Complainant, the Complainant's Group companies, and the brand the Complainant has created.

The Complainant owns the 'BETMASTER' word trademark in the European Union under registration number 018660031 dated 24 November 2022.

In addition, the Complainant owns the following figurative trademark registrations:

Trademark Registration Number	Jurisdiction	Date
Betmaster 79228369	USA	October 06, 2017
Betmaster 1392868	Kenya, Mexico, Russia, USA.	October 06, 2017
Betmaster 016577736	European Union	April 10, 2017
Betmaster 2015000057307	Italy	October 1, 2015

The Complainant holds several domain name registrations incorporating the "Betmaster" trademark, the primary being <www.betmaster.com>.

The Complainant owns the following domain names (non-exhaustive list):

<betmaster.com>, registered on October 14, 2001;

<betmaster.io>, registered on May 27, 2016;  
 <betmaster.com.mx>, registered on June 26, 2019 (exclusively for Mexican market);  
 <betmaster.pe>, registered on May 4, 2021 (exclusively for Peruvian market).

### 3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits.

1. Trademark/Service Mark Similarities:

The disputed domain name incorporate, in its entirety, the Complainant's registered trademark the "Betmaster", and merely adds the following element: A geographically descriptive term 'mexico' before the gTLD, which likely represents the country the Respondent targets with this disputed domain name;

The disputed domain name also includes generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) '.com'. The gTLDs are typically disregarded when assessing identity or confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. Accordingly, gTLD '.com', should be disregarded for the purpose of evaluating the first element of the Policy.

The fact that a domain name wholly incorporates the complainant's trademark may be sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for the purpose of the Policy, despite the addition of other words to such marks.

Regarding the addition of the geographically descriptive term 'mexico' in the disputed domain name, which otherwise incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. A side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark is typically employed. And 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 the trade mark.

Moreover, it has been held that the addition of descriptive words does nothing to prevent the confusing similarity of the established domain names.

Considering the above, the Complainant is firmly of the view that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark. The addition of a geographically descriptive term does not remove the likelihood of confusion. This leads the Complainant to believe that Internet users believe that the disputed domain name is registered and used by the Complainant to promote its products and services

on the Internet. Therefore, any activity conducted through the disputed domain name will likely be regarded as activity undertaken by the Complainant.

## 2. Respondent Domain Rights:

To date, the Respondent has made no claims to having any relevant prior rights to use the trademark “Betmaster”.

The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use any of its trademarks in any form, including in domain names.

The Respondent is not sponsored by, or legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant in any way.

The date on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name is 2025-07-08. The registration date is significantly after the Complainant’s first use in commerce, which was on October 14, 2001, and the Complainant’s first trademark registration in Italy, which was on October 1, 2015. Considering the geographic focus of the disputed domain name, it is also important to note that the Complainant registered its trademark in Mexico on October 06, 2017, well before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

When entering the term “Betmaster” into Google’s search engine, the results point to the Complainant’s domains that use its registered trademarks. The Respondent could have easily performed a similar search before registering the disputed domain name and should have done so if acting diligently. Had such a search been conducted, the Respondent would have quickly discovered that the Complainant owns the “Betmaster” trademark, which is used globally and is associated with a number of domain names.

The Complainant’s full name has become a distinctive identifier associated with the term “Betmaster” and the registration of the disputed domain name appears to take advantage of that association with the businesses that the Complainant owns.

The Respondent has not demonstrated that the disputed domain name 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 name in its entirety and that the services offered by the Respondent on the disputed domain name are identical to the services provided by the Complainant.

## 3. Domain Names Registered & used in Bad Faith:

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. The fact that the Complainant's trademarks predates the registration date of the disputed domain name demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. Furthermore, it cannot be a mere coincidence that the disputed domain name offers similar services. This strongly suggests that the Respondent knowingly registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Evidence of bad faith arises when, among other things, a respondent registers disputed domain names primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor or, by using the disputed domain names, attempts to attract, for commercial gain, users to its website or to websites operated by a contracted company, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

The conduct of the Respondent falls under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name in a manner that is likely to cause confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, apparently with the intent to divert 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 name.

The Respondent's intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain is further demonstrated by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark the "Betmaster" in its entirety, while merely adding a geographically descriptive term 'mexico'. The services offered on the disputed domain name are similar to those of the Complainant, leading to consumer confusion, as users are misled into believing the website is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

The Respondent knew of the Complainant's well-known "Betmaster" trademark and is using the disputed domain name to confuse consumers and divert Internet traffic to the Respondents website. This is supported by the following:

- the Complainant's "Betmaster" trademark is well known and specific to the Complainant in connection with online sports betting and casino services;
- the Complainant's <betmaster.com> domain name and related websites have received substantial publicity;
- There is no legitimate justification for the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name;
- The Respondent has not denied any knowledge of the Complainant or its trademark;
- The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's registered trademark "Betmaster", while adding a geographically descriptive term 'mexico', which does not reduce the likelihood of confusion;

The services offered through the disputed domain name are identical to those provided by the Complainant. This, combined with the use of the Complainant's trademark in the name of the disputed domain name, clearly gives consumers the impression that the disputed domain name is official or authorized by the Complainant – which is not the case.

At the time of composing the Complaint, the disputed domain name used the Complainant's trademark in its name and it incorporated it throughout the content of the webpages associated with the disputed domain name. After the Complainant requested that the registrar provide information on the Respondent, the registrar informed the Respondent of our request. In response, the Respondent removed all trademarks and content created by the Complainant from the disputed domain name's webpages, thereby eliminating additional proof of the Respondent's bad faith actions. Nevertheless, the Complainant maintains that the disputed domain name violates its rights. The Complainant further asserts that, more likely than not, the Respondent will continue to use the disputed domain name in bad faith due to the Respondent's prior actions and the fact that the disputed domain name still utilizes the Complainant's trademark in its name, making any potential future use of the disputed domain name impossible to be in good faith.

- **Respondent**

The Respondent did not submit an administratively compliant Response. Nevertheless, through the Registrar, the Respondent sent the following message on 3 October, 2025: "Thank you for your message. We are sorry about the situation regarding betmastermexico.com. Please be assured that we have already removed all related content from the website. We appreciate your understanding and cooperation. Kind regards".

Then on 28 November 2025, the Respondent sent this message through the Registrar: "Dear NiceNIC Abuse Team,

Thank you for your message and for bringing this matter to our attention.

Please be informed that the website associated with the domain name betmastermexico.com was taken offline and closed on 3 October. There is currently no active content being served on this domain.

If you require any additional information or further confirmation from our side, please let us know.

Kind regards".

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

## 4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

### 4.1 Requirements

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

1. the Domain Name is 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 Domain Name; and
3. the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

### 4.2 Analysis

#### 4.2.1 Procedural matters

The Complaint was filed without identifying the Respondent by name. Upon receipt of the Complaint, the Center transmitted by email to the concerned Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. The Registrar responded in due course, disclosing the identity of the underlying registrant and providing the relevant contact details.

The Registrar identified the Respondent as follows:

**Name:** Andrey Mogilnickiy

Following this disclosure, the Complainant elected not to amend the Complaint to reflect the identified registrant details.

In this respect, the Panel notes that, pursuant to paragraph 4.4.5 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, it is within the Panel's discretion to determine the appropriate Respondent against whom the proceeding should continue, taking into account all relevant due process considerations.

In the present case, based on the evidence on record, the Panel is satisfied that the correct Respondent was identified and properly notified, even prior to the formal commencement of the administrative proceeding. In particular, the record reflects an exchange available on the record dated October 3

confirming the Respondent's awareness of the dispute, as well as a further communication from the Respondent dated November 28, following commencement of the proceeding, which corroborates the Respondent's identity and awareness of the dispute against him.

Accordingly, the Panel determines that the Respondent in this proceeding is **Andrey Mogilnickiy**, as identified by the Registrar and reflected in this Decision.

That said, the Panel considers it appropriate to note that the Complainant would have been better advised, as a matter of procedural diligence and clarity, to amend the Complaint to reflect the disclosed registrant information and, where appropriate, to adjust its arguments accordingly. While this omission does not, in the circumstances of this case, give rise to a due process deficiency, panels have repeatedly emphasized that amending a complaint following registrar disclosure is a best practice that promotes procedural economy and clarity in future proceedings.

#### **4.2.2 The Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights**

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark "BETMASTER", including through a figurative mark registered since at least 2015 and a word mark registered since 2022.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's "BETMASTER" mark in its entirety, with the addition of the geographically descriptive term "mexico", followed by the gTLD ".com", which is disregarded for the purposes of the first element analysis.

It is well established that the wholesale incorporation of a complainant's trademark in a domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The addition of a descriptive or geographic term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the trademark remains clearly recognizable as the dominant element of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's "BETMASTER" trademark, and the first element of the Policy is satisfied.

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

The Complainant has put forward a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has made no

claim to any relevant prior rights in the “BETMASTER” mark. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks in any form, including in domain names, and there is no sponsorship, affiliation, or other legitimate connection between the parties.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 8, 2025, well after the Complainant’s first use of the mark in commerce on October 14, 2001, and after its trademark registrations in Italy (October 1, 2015) and Mexico (October 6, 2017). These dates demonstrate that the Complainant’s rights predate the Respondent’s registration.

The Complainant further asserts that its “BETMASTER” mark is distinctive, and that simple online searches would have revealed its use and association with the Complainant’s business. The disputed domain name reproduces the mark in its entirety and, based on the evidence on record, appears to target services identical to those offered by the Complainant, suggesting that the Respondent was seeking to capitalize on the Complainant’s goodwill rather than engaging in *bona fide* use.

The record also shows that, in communications initially dated October 3 and subsequently referred to following notification of the Complaint on November 28, the Respondent acknowledged the situation and confirmed that all related content had been removed from the website and that the website had been taken offline. Without any further explanation to the contrary, and on the balance of probability, this conduct supports the conclusion that the Respondent lacked any *bona fide* rights or legitimate interests and was seeking to take advantage of the Complainant’s goodwill.

Overall, the Respondent has not submitted any evidence to rebut the Complainant’s *prima facie* case or to demonstrate any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. In these circumstances, and on the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

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

The Complainant’s “BETMASTER” trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and based on the record at hand and balance of probabilities, the Respondent was more than likely aware of these rights, seemingly confirmed by his own admission through a communication relayed through the Registrar on his behalf. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, adding only the geographically descriptive term “mexico”, and appears to offer services identical to those of the Complainant. This strongly suggests that the Respondent intended to

capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill and divert consumers for commercial gain, a practice that is singled out as bad faith as per the Policy, as the Respondent's conduct falls within Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the domain is likely to cause confusion regarding source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

On the balance of probability, and in the absence of any administratively compliant Response or evidence to the contrary of the above-mentioned conclusions, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Accordingly, the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is satisfied.

#### **4 DECISION and ORDER**

For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the Policy, Paragraph 15 of the Rules, and Rule 10 of the Supplemental Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name is transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of 22 December, 2025

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

