



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

CIIDRC case number:	<b>25928-UDRP</b>	Decision date: January 4, 2026
Domain Name:	<b>&lt;play-betmaster.net&gt;</b>	
Panel:	<b>Ganna Prokhorova</b>	
Complainant:	<b>BMGate Ltd., former Reinvent Ltd.</b>	
Respondent:	<b>Stealles SRV LTD / Steve Jones</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:

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, and on November 26, 2025, 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 has been placed on a Registrar LOCK.

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

On November 27, 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.

**Domain Names: <play-betmaster.net>**  
**25928-UDRP**

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

In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC appointed Ganna Prokhorova, 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.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 8, 2025.

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**

The Complainant states that it is an international company engaged in the development of innovative technological solutions, products, and services, including in the finance, gaming, and betting sectors. The Complainant further states that one of its products is the Betmaster sports betting and gambling platform, an international brand offering legal online sports betting and casino services to end users who meet the applicable legal age requirements, and operating in regulated markets across Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The Complainant states that it is the owner of the numerous trademark registrations for BETMASTER. The Complainant further states that BMGate Ltd, formerly known as Reinvent Ltd, has undergone a corporate name change, which has not yet been reflected in the records of certain trademark offices. As a result, some of the trademark certificates submitted as annexes identify Reinvent Ltd as the trademark owner rather than BMGate Ltd. The Complainant explains that these entities are the same and that their names should therefore be treated interchangeably. In support of this assertion, the Complainant has submitted a Certificate of Change of Name issued in Cyprus.

The Complainant states, and provides documentation to support, that it is the owner of the following trademark registrations:

- 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".

The Complainant states, and provides screenshots in support thereof, that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering gambling-related services, including casino and betting-related content, which are identical or closely related to those offered by the Complainant under the BETMASTER brand. The website associated with the disputed domain name prominently features the term “Betmaster” throughout its content, including in the header and footer, and offers its services in multiple languages, including English, Spanish, Estonian, Greek, and Portuguese. According to the Complainant, these language options correspond to markets in which the Complainant or its affiliated companies are active, thereby increasing the likelihood of confusion among Internet users.

### **3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES**

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits that:

- (1) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BETMASTER trademark, in which it holds longstanding and well-established rights, and the additional elements do nothing to prevent confusing similarity;
- (2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is neither authorized nor affiliated with the Complainant and is using the disputed domain name to offer gambling-related services identical or closely related to those of the Complainant;
- (3) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's well-known BETMASTER trademark and is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, where such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and justifies transfer of the disputed domain name.

- **Respondent**

The Respondent did not submit any Response and has not replied to the Complainant's contentions.

- **Remedy Sought**

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

### **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 disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
3. the disputed 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 The Disputed Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which it has rights.

Based on the evidence submitted, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the BETMASTER trademark through multiple registrations in numerous jurisdictions. These trademark registrations long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel further accepts the Complainant's explanation that BMGate Ltd is the successor in name to Reinvent Ltd, the entity listed as owner on certain trademark certificates, and that both names refer to the same legal entity. See also *BMGate Ltd., former Reinvent Ltd. vs Thierry Jean Felix Martinez*, CIIDRC Case 25759-UDRP; *BMGate Ltd., former Reinvent Ltd. vs Andrey Mogilnickiy*, CIIDRC Case 25912-UDRP.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's BETMASTER trademark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive term "play" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. As set out in section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), the test for confusing similarity involves a straightforward comparison between the trademark and the domain name, and where the relevant trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar.

The Panel further notes that the insertion of a hyphen between the terms "play" and "betmaster" is a technical element without any distinctive character and does not affect the overall impression of the disputed domain name. Consistent with section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the addition of descriptive or generic terms to a complainant's trademark does not avoid confusing similarity where the trademark remains the dominant and recognizable element.

Finally, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

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

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, panels have consistently recognized that this element involves proving a negative. Accordingly, where a complainant establishes a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence demonstrating such rights or legitimate interests. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case.

The Respondent has made no claim to any trademark or service mark rights in BETMASTER, nor has the Respondent demonstrated any prior rights or legitimate interests corresponding to the disputed domain name. There is no evidence in the case file that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has credibly asserted, and there is no evidence to the contrary, that it has never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the BETMASTER trademark in any manner, including as part of a domain name. The Respondent is not sponsored by, affiliated with, or otherwise connected to the Complainant.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered on August 8, 2025, which is well after the Complainant secured multiple trademark registrations in various jurisdictions. In light of the longstanding and widespread use of the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name wholly incorporating the BETMASTER trademark strongly weighs against any claim of rights or legitimate interests.

The Respondent has also failed to demonstrate use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. To the contrary, the evidence shows that the has been used to offer gambling services that are identical to those provided by the Complainant. The Complainant's BETMASTER trademark is reproduced in its entirety and is prominently displayed throughout the website associated with the disputed domain name, including in the header and footer, creating the clear impression of an official or authorized relationship with the Complainant.

Such use, which trades on the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark and seeks to create confusion as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel also considers it relevant that the website associated with the disputed domain name targets multiple language markets that correspond to territories in which the Complainant operates in the online betting and gambling sector. This further supports the conclusion that the Respondent is seeking to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's established reputation rather than pursuing any independent or legitimate business purpose.

The Respondent has not submitted any Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's *prima facie* case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

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

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met this requirement.

The Complainant's BETMASTER trademark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Given the longevity, geographic scope, and commercial prominence of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

The evidence also demonstrates bad faith use. The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering gambling-related services that are identical or closely related to those provided by the Complainant. The Complainant's BETMASTER trademark is used prominently throughout the website, including in the header, footer, and general content, creating a clear likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the website operated under the disputed domain name is an official website of, or is authorized or affiliated with, the Complainant. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which provides that bad faith is established where a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name precisely for this purpose.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has not come forward to deny knowledge of the Complainant or to offer any plausible legitimate explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name. In the absence of any such explanation, and taking into account the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds that there is no conceivable good-faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) and paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

## 5. 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 January 4, 2025

SIGNATURE OF PANEL



---

