



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

CIIDRC case number:	25909-UDRP	Decision date: January 22. 2026
Domain Name:	<betmaster-estonia.net>	
Registrar:	NameCheap	
Panel:	Peter Müller	
Complainant:	BMGate Ltd., former Reinvent Ltd.	
Respondent:	Valentina Vorsovska	

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

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

1. On October 16, 2025, Dmitrii Kashevarov filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via online platform on behalf of the Complainant. The required fee was paid on November 18, 2025.
2. CIIDRC transmitted by email to the concerned Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name, and 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. The Complainant was informed of the Respondent's information as provided by the Registrar and subsequently declined to amend the Complaint.
4. On December 1, 2025, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the administrative dispute resolution process. 5. On December 1, 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.

Domain Names: <betmaster-estonia.net>
25909-UDRP

6. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for December 22, 2025.

7. The Respondent has failed to file its response.

8. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single member. The required Panel fee deposit was received on January 9, 2026.

9. CIIDRC appointed Peter Müller as a single-member panel in the above-referenced matter. He accepted the appointment.

10. The Panel finds that it is properly constituted and has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by CIIDRC to ensure compliance with the UDRP.

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 is an international company that develops innovative technological solutions, products, and services in areas such as the finance, gaming and betting industries. One of the products that the Complainant has designed and produced is the Betmaster sports betting and gambling site, which provides online sports betting and casino services to end customers who meet the legal age requirements. It operates in regulated markets across Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Complainant owns several trademarks for BETMASTER, including EU trademark registration no. 018660031, which was filed on February 23, 2022 and registered on November 24, 2022, in classes 9, 36, 41, and 42 (hereinafter referred to as the 'BETMASTER Mark'). The Complainant also holds several domain name registrations incorporating the BETMASTER Mark, including <betmaster.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on May 13, 2025 and is being used in connection with a website offering cashback and bonuses for the Complainant's services. The website prominently features the Complainant's logo, which is also trademarked. Upon clicking on any interactive content on the Domain Name, consumers are redirected to 'GGbetplay.com', a casino operating in the same industry as the complainant and therefore a direct competitor.

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

3.1 Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical to the BETMASTER Mark, as it fully incorporates the mark, and as the additional word 'estonia' is descriptive and does not eliminate the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent has made no claims to having any relevant prior rights to use the trademark 'Betmaster', that the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use any of its trademarks in any form, including in domain names, that the Respondent is not sponsored by, or legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant in any way, that the registration of the Domain Name appears to take advantage of that association with the well-known businesses that the Complainant owns, and that the Respondent has not demonstrated that the Domain Name will be used in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Regarding bad faith registration, the Complainant notes that the Respondent provides services related to the Complainant's services and deliberately registered the Domain Name to refer to the Complainant's well-known business. The Complainant also notes that it provides its services within the territory of Estonia, which is the same geography targeted by the Respondent through the Domain Name, and that it cannot be a mere coincidence that the Respondent chose to target this specific geography with the Domain Name. Regarding bad faith use, the Complainant alleges that, by using the Domain Name, the Respondent attempts to attract users to its website or to websites operated by a contracted company for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the BETMASTER Mark.

3.2 Respondent

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

3.3 Remedy Sought

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

The inquiry under the first element is in two parts. The first issue is whether the Complainant has UDRP-relevant rights in a trademark and the second is whether any such trademark is identical or confusingly similar to the disputed domain name. Failure on either of the two issues would result in a failure to meet the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and ultimately in failure of the Complaint.

The Complainant provided evidence that it owns registered rights in the trademark 'BETMASTER, which predate the registration of the Domain Name by over a decade.

It is well established that a disputed domain name is generally to be considered as confusingly similar under the Policy where the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. In this case, the Domain Name fully incorporates the BETMASTER Mark, and the additional generic element 'estonia' does little to prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the BETMASTER Mark and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name

Even though the Policy requires the complainant to prove that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, it is the consensus view among UDRP panels that a complainant has to make only a *prima facie* case to fulfill the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. As a result, once a *prima facie* case is made, the burden of coming forward with evidence of the respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name will then shift to the respondent (cf. section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0).

The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and that the burden of production has been shifted to the Respondent.

The Respondent has not in any way denied these allegations and has therefore failed to provide any allegations or evidence to establish any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Based on the evidence before the Panel, the Panel cannot find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent either. In particular, the Panel finds that the Respondent's website does not meet the *Oki Data* criteria as the Respondent, at least, has not disclosed its total lack of relationship or connection to the Complainant but rather prominently referred to the Complainant, which gives the false impression that the pages were at least authorized by the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name under paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

4.2.3 Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith.

First, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the Domain Name with full knowledge of Complainant and its BETMASTER Mark and therefore in bad faith. The BETMASTER Mark is well-established. Furthermore, the Respondent offers services related to the Complainant's business and uses the Complainant's logo on its website. It is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the Domain Name in good faith.

Second, by using the Domain Name in connection with a commercial website offering cashback and bonuses for the Complainant's services and providing commercial links to the website of one of the Complainant's competitors, the Respondent was, in all likelihood, trying to divert traffic intended for the Complainant's website to its own for commercial gain as set out under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <betmaster-estonia.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of January 22, 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL



