



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	25937-UDRP	Decision date: January 20, 2026
Domain Name:	betmaster-casino-mx.com	
Registrar:	Hosting Concepts B.V.	
Panel:	Zak Muscovitch	
Complainant:	BMGate Ltd., formerly Reinvent Ltd.	
Respondent:	Nina Fedko	

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This matter is conducted pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”), and the Supplemental Rules (“Supplemental Rules”) of the Canadian International Internet Dispute Resolution Centre (“CIIDRC”). The procedural history of this case was set out in a letter dated January 14, 2026 from the CIIDRC to the Panel, as follows:

- a) On November 5, 2025, Dmitrii Kashevarov, on behalf of the Complainant, filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via CIIDRC’s online platform. The required fee was paid on November 18, 2025.

- b) CIIDRC transmitted by email to the concerned registrar, Hosting Concepts B.V. (the “Registrar”) a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <betmaster-casino-mx.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name” or the “Domain Name”), and the Registrar responded and provided CIIDRC with the recorded registrant information of the registrant, confirmed that the language of the Registration is English, confirmed that the Domain Name was registered on April 8, 2025, and confirmed that the Domain Name had been locked pending the UDRP proceeding.
- c) The Complainant was informed of the Respondent’s registrant information as provided by the Registrar and subsequently declined to amend the Complaint
- d) On December 10, 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.
- e) On December 10, 2025, CIIDRC confirmed the administrative compliance of the Complaint and the commencement of the administrative dispute resolution process.
- f) On December 10, 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.
- g) The deadline for submitting a Response was set for December 30, 2025.
- h) The Respondent did not file a response.
- i) The Complainant has elected a Panel consisting of a single member. The required Panel fee deposit was received by CIIDRC on January 9, 2026.
- j) In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC appointed the undersigned as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter.

The Panelist duly completed and returned to the CIIDRC, a Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, dated January 20, 2026.

The Panelist finds that the Domain Name is subject to the Policy pursuant to the Registrar's Registration Agreement, which incorporates the Policy by reference.

2. RELIEF SOUGHT

The Complainant requests that the Domain Name be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant pursuant to Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy.

3. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES

The Complainant

The Complainant states that it is an international company products and services in areas such as the finance, gaming and betting industries, including in particular, the Betmaster sports betting and gambling website and operates in regulated markets across Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Complainant owns the domain names, betmaster.com, betmaster.io, betmaster.com.mx, amongst several other which it has owned for many years. The Complainant claims that its BETMASTER trademark has a well-known presence in online media including in reviews and articles from specialized websites across various countries. The Complainant claims that it enjoys wide consumer recognition and acceptance of its brand and has spent several thousand United States dollars on advertising and promotion.

The Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 8, 2025 which is significantly after the Complainant's claimed date of first use in commerce, namely October 1, 2015. The Complainant claims that when entering the term 'Betmaster' into Google's search engine, the returned results point to the Complainant's domain names which utilize its registered trademarks and accordingly that 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 claims that it cannot be a mere coincidence that the Respondent specifically targets Mexico with the Domain Name, as Mexico is a jurisdiction where the Complainant already provides gambling services through its domain name

<betmaster.com.mx> via an affiliate company that has the right to use the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant claims that; a) the Complainant's trademark is used in the Disputed Domain Name in its entirety; b) the services offered by the Respondent on the Disputed Domain Name are identical to those offered by the Complainant; and c) the Disputed Domain Name utilizes the Complainant's word mark "Betmaster" throughout the Disputed Domain Name and provides a print out of the Respondent's website which shows a "Betmaster Casino" website in Spanish that inter alia offers a welcome offer for sports gambling and describes the "Betmaster Casino". The Complainant also claims that the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name redirects visitors to websites of competitors.

The Complainant claims that it meets the three-part criteria for transfer of the Domain Name under the UDRP and requests the transfer accordingly.

The Respondent.

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

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.

4.2 Analysis

4.2.1 That the Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights

The Complainant submits that it underwent a change of corporate name from “Reinvent Ltd.” to BMGGate Ltd. The Complainant provided a copy of an official Cypriot Certificate of Name Change dated March 16, 2023 together with an English translation which confirmed the name change. The Panel further confirmed the name change by visiting the website of the Companies Section of the Republic of Cyprus and conducting a search therein.

The Complainant further submitted that its trademark registrations are still under its former name because they have not yet been updated. A corporate name change is just that, a corporate name change with the entity remaining the same. Whatever trademark registration remains under its former corporate name continue to be owned by the same entity just with an updated corporate name. Accordingly, the Complainant, BMGGate Ltd. will be treated as the owner of any trademarks that continue to be registered under its former corporate name for the purposes of this proceeding.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for BETMASTER in connection with inter alia, software and betting services, including but not limited to Italy (Registration 2015000057307, registered October 1, 2015), USA (Registration No. 6138343, registered September 1, 2020), EU (Registration No. 016577736, Registered November 24, 2022), and Mexico (Registration No. 1392868, Registered October 6, 2017).

The Domain Name, <betmaster-casino-mx.com> fully incorporates the Complainant’s BETMASTER trademarks. The fact that a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant’s registered mark is generally sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy (See: [Six Continent Hotels, Inc. v. The Omnicorp](#), WIPO Case No. D2005-1249). That addition of the descriptive term, “casino” and the descriptive geographic acronym “mx” which commonly denotes Mexico, do nothing to avoid confusing similarity with the Complainant’s trademarks (See for example; [Westfield Corp. v. Hobbs, D2000-0227](#) (WIPO May 18, 2000) (westfieldshopping.com)). In fact, the addition of these two descriptive terms adds to the confusing similarity with the Complainant’s trademarks since the word “casino”

describes the Complainant's services and the term "mx" describes a market for the Complainant's services.

Accordingly, the Complainant has proven that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks in accordance with Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

4.2.2.1 That the Respondent has No Rights or Legitimate Interest in the Domain Name

It is well established that the Complainant must first make a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and then the burden shifts to the Respondent to show that it does in fact have rights or legitimate interest in the domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a *prima facie* case. As the Complainant contends; a) The Disputed Domain Name utilizes the Complainant's word mark "Betmaster" in the Disputed Domain Name; b) To date, the Respondent has made no claims to having any relevant prior rights to use the trademark 'Betmaster'; c) The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use any of its trademarks in any form, including in domain names; d) The Respondent is not sponsored by, or legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant in any way; e) the Domain Name refers to Mexico which is a jurisdiction where the Complainant has trademark rights and offers its gambling services; and f) the Respondent is using the Domain services which are similar if not identical to those offered by the Complainant. Moreover, none of the non-exhaustive enumerated grounds at Paragraph 4(c) or any other grounds which could demonstrate a right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name have been provided by the Respondent nor otherwise appear to exist. In essence, and as will be discussed further below, the Respondent appears to have selected a Domain Name to trade off of the Complainant's goodwill and to misdirect confused users. Such use cannot amount to a right or legitimate interest.

4.2.3 That the Respondent has Registered and Used the Domain Name in Bad Faith

To establish bad faith for the purposes of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith and that it has been used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy states bad faith may be found where the Respondent uses the Domain Name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain,

Domain Names: <betmaster-casino-mx.com>
25937-UDRP

Internet users to a web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Although the Complainant contended that it has a “well-known presence in online media” including “reviews and articles from specialized websites across various countries” and that its reputation is such that it has “positioned itself as a reliable source of entertainment for people around the world”, no evidence whatsoever has been provided to support these statements. Similarly, the Complainant contends that “when entering the term ‘Betmaster’ into Google’s search engine, the returned results point to the Complainant’s domains which demonstrates that the Respondent would have or should have likely been aware of the Complainant, but without any evidence to support this contention such the relied upon Google results.

Accordingly, the Complainant unfortunately provided no evidence of reputation that could have served to prove that the Respondent likely had heard of the Complainant and its mark and was thus the Respondent’s target for the Domain Name registration.

Nevertheless, on a balance of probabilities, it is far more likely that the Respondent had been aware of the Complainant and therefore selected the Disputed Domain Name specifically because of the Complainant. This is so for several reasons. First, anyone who is legitimately considering adopting <betmaster-casino-mx.com> as a domain name for a bona fide purpose, would almost invariably first check to see whether <Betmaster.com> and <betmaster.com.mx> are already taken and being used for online casino services, since these are all far preferable domain names to the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel is therefore able to infer based upon a balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s business and brand and proceeded to register and use the Domain Name despite that. This is bad faith registration and use. Secondly, it is very unlikely to be a coincidence that the Respondent independently conceived of the Domain Name and began using it in connection with online casino services without an awareness and targeting of the Complainant. The Domain Name corresponds to a fairly distinctive term and although it’s conceivable that someone independently selected and used the Domain Name in connection with casino services, if that had been the case an innocent Respondent would have and should have come forward with their explanation and corroborating evidence. Thirdly, the use

of a geographic acronym such as “mx” in combination with a trademark is a common practice amongst cybersquatters (see for example; <https://udrp.tools/?s=d1a9770c>). Lastly, the Respondent’s use of the Domain Name, i.e. for a fairly simplistic website that appears likely to use a third-party affiliate program or which has some other arrangement rather than apparently herself directly providing online casino services is another common indicia of cybersquatting when done in connection with a Domain Name that comprises a distinctive and longstanding trademark. In regard to the latter, it would have been helpful had the Complainant provided more information and more evidence about the Respondent’s use instead of relying upon a single untranslated screenshot of the splash page of the Respondent’s website.

In any event, it is likely that it was not a coincidence that the Respondent selected a Domain Name that corresponds nearly identically to the Complainant’s trademarks and has used it for a competing business. The Complainant likely purposefully registered the Domain Name in bad faith to capitalize upon the deception that the Domain Name would facilitate. The Panelist therefore finds that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant and specifically targeted the Complainant’s trademarks when registering and using the disputed Domain Name in an infringing manner. This constitutes bad faith registration and bad faith use as understood by 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 Domain Name, <betmaster-casino-mx.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of January 20, 2026

“Zak Muscovitch”

Zak Muscovitch, Panelist

