



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	25934-UDRP	Decision date: January 15, 2026.
Domain Name:	<betmaster-casino-mexico.com>	
Registrar:	NameCheap	
Panel:	Alan Limbury	
Complainant:	BMGate Ltd., formerly Reinvent Ltd.	
Respondent:	Dominic Toretto	

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 November 4, 2025, Dmitrii Kashevarov, on behalf of 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.

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 2, 2025, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the administrative dispute resolution process.

5. On December 2, 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.

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.”

In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC appointed Alan Limbury as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter.

The Domain Name was registered on September 24, 2024.

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

Complainant, BMGate Ltd, previously known as Reinvent Ltd, is an international company developing innovative technological solutions, products and services in areas such as the finance, gaming and betting industries. The Complainant designed and produced the Betmaster sports betting and gambling website at “www.betmaster.com”. The Complainant holds registrations for the trademark BETMASTER in several jurisdictions, including México, namely International Registration No. 1392858, registered on October 6, 2017. The Complainant registered the domain name <betmaster.com.mx> on June 26, 2019.

The <**betmaster-casino-mexico.com**> Domain Name was registered on September 24, 2024.

CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark.

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 and the Respondent is not sponsored by, or legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. 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 (1) the Complainant's trademark is used in the Disputed Domain Name in its entirety, (2) the services offered by the Respondent on the Disputed Domain Name are identical to those offered by the Complainant, and (3) the Disputed Domain Name utilizes the Complainant's word mark "Betmaster" throughout the Disputed Domain Name, as well as the Complainant's figurative trademark in the header of the Disputed Domain Name.

It also cannot be a mere coincidence that the Respondent targets Mexico, the 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. This, in itself, demonstrates not only a lack of *bona fide* use, but also constitutes an act of bad faith.

The fact that the Complainant's trademarks predate the registration date of the Disputed Domain Name demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. The Disputed Domain Name offers similar services. This strongly suggests that the Respondent knowingly registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

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 them to the Disputed Domain Name.

Respondent

As noted above, the Respondent failed to file a response.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

3. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

3.1 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.

3.2 Analysis

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

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

The Complainant has shown that it has rights *inter alia* in the figurative mark BETMASTER, registered in many countries, including in Mexico, namely International Trademark Reg. No. 1392868, registered on October 6, 2017 for *inter alia* betting services, in International Class 41.

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.0, ¶ 1.7.

The Panel finds the Respondent's <betmaster-casino-mexico.com> Domain Name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's BETMASTER mark, differing only by the addition of hyphens and the words "casino" and "Mexico", which differences are insufficient to distinguish the Domain Name from the Mark and instead evoke the Complainant's business in Mexico. The inconsequential ".com" generic top-level domain ("gTLD") may be ignored under this element. See, for example, *Rollerblade, Inc. v. Chris McCrady*, D2000-0429 (WIPO June 25, 2000).

4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence presented, shall demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests to a domain name for purposes of Paragraph 4(a)(ii):

- (i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the use by the Respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

As noted above, the Respondent's <betmaster-casino-mexico.com> Domain Name was registered on September 24, 2024, almost seven years after the Complainant registered its BETMASTER mark in Mexico. It

resolves to a website headed BETMASTER, followed by (in Spanish) “Casino and Betting Betmaster México” and offering online betting services.

These circumstances, together with the Complainant’s assertions, are sufficient to constitute a *prima facie* showing of absence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name on the part of the Respondent. The evidentiary burden therefore shifts to the Respondent to show that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. See *JUUL Labs, Inc. v. Dryx Emerson / KMF Events LTD*, FA1906001849706 (FORUM July 17, 2019). The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is expressed in the conjunctive: “the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith” and Paragraph 4(b) sets out four illustrative circumstances, which, though not exclusive, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii), including:

- (iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your 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 of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

The circumstances set out above in relation to the second element satisfy the Panel that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its BETMASTER mark when the Respondent registered the **<betmaster-casino-mexico.com>** Domain Name and that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website and of the services promoted on that website. This demonstrates registration and use in bad faith to attract users for commercial gain under Policy ¶ 4(b)(iv).

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 **<betmaster-casino-mexico.com>** Domain Name be TRANSFERRED from the Respondent to the Complainant.

Made as of January 15, 2026.

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

