

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dareos LTD., Dareos INC. v. Global Domain Privacy Services Inc, Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd., Global Domain Privacy Services Inc, Alexander Strunin, Maria Hanina, Natalya Pladzidina, Anastasia Voloshina, and Svetlana Sboychikova
Case No. D2022-1023

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Dareos LTD, Cyprus, and Dareos INC., the Marshall Islands, represented by Mapa Trademarks SL, Spain.

The Respondents are Global Domain Privacy Services Inc, Cyprus, Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd., Belize, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc, Panama, Alexander Strunin, Russian Federation ("Russia"), Maria Hanina, Russia, Natalya Pladzidina, Russia, Anastasia Voloshina, Russia, and Svetlana Sboychikova, Russia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <casino-vulcan.win>, <cazinovulkan777.website>, <club-russian-vulkan.online>, <club-vulcan-platinum.online>, <sms-vulcan.com>, <vip-vulcan-clubs.com>, <vip-vulgans-club.com>, <vlkmillion.xyz>, <vulcancazino.xyz>, <vulcan-club.website>, <vulcan-connection.com>, <vulcan-deluxe.uno>, <vulcan-grand-vip.com>, <vulcan-lev.uno>, <vulcan-million.club>, <vulcan-prestige.uno>, <vulkan-all-games.space>, <vulkan-azart-games.site>, <vulkan-bitcoin-casino.club>, <vulkan-champion.website>, <vulkandeluxe-app.website>, <vulkandeluxe-bonus.site>, <vulkandeluxe-mobile.space>, <vulkandeluxe-money.uno>, <vulkandeluxe-registration.xyz>, <vulkan-deluxe.site>, <vulkandeluxe-site.website>, <vulkandeluxe-zerkalo.xyz>, <vulkandeluxe777.club>, <vulkan-download.club>, <vulkan-emulators.club>, <vulkan-for-free.club>, <vulkan-full-version.site>, <vulkan-game-udacha.com>, <vulkangrand-download.website>, <vulkangrand-mobile.site>, <vulkan-igrovie-avtomaty.club>, <vulkan-king.uno>, <vulkan-olimp.website>, <vulkan-on-money.uno>, <vulkan-on-real.xyz>, <vulkanplatinum-app.site>, <vulkanplatinum-bonus.club>, <vulkanplatinum-club.website>, <vulkanplatinum-mobile.online>, <vulkanplatinum-money.website>, <vulkanplatinum-site.site>, <vulkanplatinum-vhod.xyz>, <vulkanplatinum-zerkalo.uno>, <vulkanplatinum777.space>, <vulkanpobeda-bonuses.xyz>, <vulkanpobeda-zerkalo.uno>, <vulkanprestige-bonus.online>, <vulkanprestige-download.uno>, <vulkanprestige-promokod.club>, <vulkanprestige-zerkalo.space>, <vulkan-prilozhenie.online>, <vulkanrussia-app.xyz>, <vulkanrussia-bonus.uno>, <vulkanrussia-club.online>, <vulkanrussia-mobile.site>, <vulkanrussia-money.online>, <vulkanrussia-registration.space>, <vulkanrussia-site.xyz>, <vulkanrussia-vhod.club>, <vulkanrussia777.website>, <vulkanslots-casino.uno>, <vulkan-slots-free.site>, <vulkan-win50.online>, <vulkan-zal.space>, <vulkan-24.uno>.

<vulkan777-slots.club>, <wulcan-club-platinum.club>, <wulcan-grand.site>, <wulcan-mobile.online>, <wulkancasino.uno>, and <24-wulkan.club> are registered with URL Solutions, Inc. (the “First Registrar”).

The disputed domain name <vip-slots-vulcan.net> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Second Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 24, 2022. On March 24, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 25, 2022, the Second Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names, which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. On March 26, 2022, the First Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names, which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on March 28, 2022, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on March 31, and May 5, 2022.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 11, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 31, 2022. The Respondents did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 3, 2022.

The Center appointed Kiyoshi Tsuru as the sole panelist in this matter on June 22, 2022. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

3.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation

Consolidation of multiple respondents, and multiple domain names may be appropriate, under paragraphs 3(c) and 10(e) of the Rules, even when differently named domain name Registrants are involved, where the particular circumstances of a given case indicate that common control is being exercised over the disputed domain names.

In accordance with the information provided by the relevant Registrars, the Registrants of the disputed domain names are Global Domain Privacy Services Inc, Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd., Global Domain Privacy Services Inc, Alexander Strunin, Maria Hanina, Natalya Pladzidina, Anastasia Voloshina, and Svetlana Sboychikova.

The Complainants have requested to consolidate multiple domain names owned by different Registrants in the same proceeding, alleging that all the disputed domain names appear to be subject to common control.

In particular, the Complainants argued the following:

(i) In the present case, the Respondents are the same as those of the following cases: *Dareos Ltd. and Dareos Inc. v. Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Anastasia Voloshina, Alexander Strunin, Natalya Pladzidina, Nikolay Sharov; Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Aleksey Petrov, Ivan Ivanov; Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd.; Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) / Nikolay Nefedov, IT. Main* WIPO Case No. [D2020-2581](#), *Dareos Ltd, Dareos Inc. v. Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd., Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com / Aleksandr Strunin, Anastasiya Voloshina, Yuriy Sharov, Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Anastasia Voloshina, Svetlana Sboychikova, Natalya Pladzidina, Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) / Nikolay Nefedov, IT. Main, Novolux Services Limitada, Bonostar Limited* WIPO Case No. [D2020-3556](#), and *Dareos Ltd., Dareos Inc. v. Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd.; Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Andrey Daviduk; Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Natalya Pladzidina; Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Alexander Strunin; Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Maria Hanina; Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Svetlana Sboychikova; Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Anastasia Voloshina; and ?????????? ?????????? WIPO Case No. [D2021-2175](#).*

(ii) Most websites to which the disputed domain names resolve are identical in their design, graphics, layouts, texts, favicons, the same set of games, operational company and contact information, and payment instruments.

(iii) On the “about us page” most of the disputed domain names have the same information (except for the disputed domain name <vulcan-connection.com>), mentioning as Operational company Bonostar Limited, and the License holder Novolux Services Limitada.

(iv) The website to which the disputed domain name <vulcan-connection.com> resolves, despite having different Operational company and License holder information, on the “about us page” has the same contact phone numbers and email address as the websites to which the other disputed domain names resolve.

(v) All the disputed domain names lead to the domain name <perestroika.team>.

(vi) The disputed domain names were registered in different groups on the same dates.

(vii) All of the Respondents have the same domain name in their registered email, in the corresponding Whois records.

Taking the above into account, and pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, considering that the Complainants have proven that the disputed domains names are subject to common control, this Panel decides to consolidate the disputed domain names in this proceeding, in order to maintain the spirit of the Policy, which is to make available to the parties a simple, cost-effective, and expeditious procedure (see section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”); see also *BMW v. Mike Lee / WHOISGUARD PROTECTED, WHOISGUARD, INC., Yang Xiao, Xiao Yang, Ning Li, Li Ning, MIKE LEE*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2268](#)).

4. Factual Background

The Complainants are a Russian company, based in *Вулкан*, which can be translated as “Vulcan” or “Volcano” in the Latin alphabet.

Since at least 1992, the Complainants have been providing gaming, casino, and entertainment products and services in Russia and different countries in Europe.

The Complainants have more than 2,000 employees, more than 230 gaming clubs, and more than 6,300 gaming machines deployed throughout Europe.

The Complainants are the owner of several trademark registrations, among others, the following:

Trademark	No. Registration	Jurisdiction	Date of Registration
ВУЛКАН 	342290	Russia	January 1, 2008
ВУЛКАН 	342291	Russia	January 1, 2008
VOLCANO	307879	Russia	June 2, 2006
VULKAN	353692	Russia	June 25, 2008
VULKAN IGROVYE KLUBY 	992196	International Registration	October 17, 2008
VULKAN 	977713	International Registration	August 12, 2008
VULKAN	984297	International Registration	August 11, 2008
VULKAN 	791038	International Registration	September 3, 2002
VULKAN 	308351	Czech Republic	October 21, 2009
ВУЛКАН 	014193544	European Union	September 23, 2015
VULKAN 	302008017149	Germany	February 24, 2009

VULKAN 	65021	Latvia	July 20, 2012
VULKAN	Z20080153	Croatia	January 19, 2009

The Respondents registered the disputed domain names during 2021 (long after the dates of registration of the Complainant's trademarks).

The disputed domain names resolve to websites that host online casinos and gaming services.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar

That the disputed domain names were created in 2021 and are currently being used to offer the same services as those that the Complainants (or its licensees) provide under the Complainants trademarks.

That most of the disputed domain names include the word element "Vulkan" or "Vulcan" or "Volcano", which is identical to the Complainants trademarks.

That the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants trademarks since they incorporate them almost entirely.

That some of the disputed domain names incorporate the abbreviation of the Complainants trademarks, namely, "VLK" which constitutes a typosquatting conduct, and that, therefore, these disputed domain names are also confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.

That the disputed domain names incorporate different generic terms which are irrelevant under the Policy when determining confusing similarity.

That said generic terms create additional confusion among Internet consumers, due to their direct association with the Complainants, and the operation and management of its casinos and gaming halls.

That due to the composition of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve, users may actually believe that there might be a real connection between the disputed domain names and the Complainants.

That all of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve use the Complainants trademarks, and have identical design elements.

That the disputed domain names mislead consumers into thinking that they are either owned by or associated with the Complainants.

II. Rights or Legitimate Interests

That the Respondents are not licensees of the Complainants, nor have they been authorized to use the Complainants trademarks in any way.

That the Respondents registered the disputed domain names in hopes of intentionally attracting, for commercial gain, Internet users to the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve by creating a likelihood of confusion.

That the disputed domain names bear no relation to any legitimate business of the Respondents.

That the Respondents have not shown any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection to a *bona fide* offering of goods and services.

That the Respondents have not been commonly known by the disputed domain names. That, instead, the Respondents have been hiding behind a privacy service.

That the Respondents have no rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

III. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

That the Respondents' use of the Complainants trademarks constitutes trademark infringement.

That the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve, which offer casino and gaming services, were created for commercial gain.

That the Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain names by creating a likelihood of confusion, which is a fraudulent conduct.

That it has been established in previous cases decided under the Policy that the incorporation of someone else's trademark in a domain name without authorization, for commercial gain, cannot be presumed to have been carried out in good faith.

That the Respondents have obviously attempted to capitalize on the Complainants reputation, as well as to trade-off the goodwill of the Complainants trademarks.

That the Respondents are not only using the Complainants trademarks in bad faith but are also using texts that refer to the Complainants history and reputation, while distorting facts to emphasize their own user experience.

That the Respondents have also placed a copyright sign in the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve, in order to try to create a sense of "genuineness".

That there have been previous UDRP disputes between the Complainants and the Respondents.

That the Respondents have no legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and are not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of said disputed domain names.

That the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith as evidenced by the Respondents' hidden identity, typosquatting, and obvious attempt to attract users by creating a likelihood of confusion to trade off the fame and goodwill of the Complainants trademarks.

B. Respondent

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainants contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants are required to prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the

Complainants has rights;

- (ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Given the Respondents' failure to submit a formal Response, the Panel may decide this proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed factual allegations, in accordance with paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules, (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#)).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants trademarks since said disputed domain names include the Complainants trademarks entirely (or the abbreviation "VLK" thereof), with the addition of various additional terms.

Generally, previous panels appointed under the Policy have found that the inclusion of additional terms in a disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element (see sections 1.7, and 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)). In the present case, the disputed domain names incorporate several terms (related to the Complainant's business) such as "cazino", "casino", "club", "million", "all-games" "deluxe", "slots", "grand", and "platinum", to name a few.

Moreover, the disputed domain names <vlkmillion.xyz>, <wulcan-club-platinum.club>, <wulcan-grand.site>, <wulcan-mobile.online>, <wulkancasino.uno>, <24-wulkan.club>, and <vip-vulcans-club.com> constitute a case of typosquatting, considering that the Respondents intentionally misspelled the Complainants trademark by: 1) abbreviating it "VLK" (in this regard the Panel takes note of a clear pattern of targeting the Complainant both in terms of the number of domain names and the website content), 2) writing it with a "w" instead of a "v", and 3) adding an "s" after the Complainant's trademark (see section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); see also *Schneider Electric S.A. v. Domain Whois Protect Service / Cyber Domain Services Pvt. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2333](#); *Rolls-Royce plc v. John Holt.*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1842](#); *Mastercard Prepaid Management Services Limited v. Cash SDSD.*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1938](#); and *ZB, N.A., a national banking association, dba Zions First National Bank v. Sharon White*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1769](#)).

Finally, the addition of the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".win", ".website", ".online", ".com", ".net", ".xyz", ".uno", ".site", ".space", and ".club" to the disputed domain names constitutes a technical requirement of the Domain Name System ("DNS"). Thus, it generally has no legal significance in assessing identity or confusing similarity in the present case (see *CARACOLITO S SAS v. Nelson Brown, OXM.CO*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0268](#); *SAP SE v. Mohammed Aziz Sheikh, Sapteq Global Consulting Services*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0565](#); and *Bentley Motors Limited v. Domain Admin / Kyle Rocheleau, Privacy Hero Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1919](#)).

Therefore, the first element of the Policy has been met.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets forth the following examples as circumstances where a respondent may have rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name;

- (i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, the use by the respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed 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 disputed domain name, even if it did not acquire 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 consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. The Complainants have proven to be the owner of several registrations for the VULKAN trademarks in different jurisdictions.

The Complainants have asserted that there is no relationship or affiliation between the Complainants and the Respondents, that it has not granted any license, permission, authorization, or other rights to the Respondents to use its trademarks, and that the Respondents have not been commonly known by the disputed domain names (see cases *Beyoncé Knowles v. Sonny Ahuja*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1431](#); and *Six Continents Hotels, Inc. v. IQ Management Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0272](#)). The Respondents did not contest these allegations.

The Respondents' election of the disputed domain names, which consist of the Complainants trademarks, and of a typosquatted version of said trademarks, shows that the Respondents have targeted the Complainants, its trademarks, and its business. The Respondents took no measures whatsoever to make it clear to Internet users visiting the websites, to which the disputed domain names resolve, that they are not operated by the Complainants. Therefore, the Respondents' conduct cannot be considered a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names (see *Wachovia Corporation v. Peter Carrington*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0775](#); and *Edmunds.com, Inc. v. Digi Real Estate Foundation* WIPO Case No. [D2006-1043](#)).

The Complainants demonstrated that the websites, to which the disputed domain names resolve, offer services that compete with those of the Complainants. The websites also display the Complainant's trademarks extensively, which shows that the Respondents have attempted to impersonate or pass-off as the Complainants, since the display of said trademarks misleads Internet users as to the source or sponsorship of the services rendered by the Respondents, while clearly seeking a commercial gain (see sections 2.5.1, 2.5.2., and 2.5.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), as well as UDRP cases *The Royal Edinburgh Military Tattoo Limited v. Identity Protection Service, Identity Protect Limited / Martin Clegg, WM Holdings*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2290](#); *Fulham Football Club (1987) Limited, Tottenham Hotspur Public Limited, West Ham United Football Club PLC, Manchester United Limited, The Liverpool Football Club And Athletic Grounds Limited v. Domains by Proxy, Inc./ Official Tickets Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0331](#); *Suncor Energy Inc. v. Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc. / andre bechamp*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-2123](#); and *Segway Inc. v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Arthur Andreasyan, NIM*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0725](#)).

Panels appointed under the Policy have found that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as impersonation or passing off, cannot confer rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name (see section 2.13 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); see also *Self-Portrait IP Limited v. Franklin Kelly*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0283](#)).

The Complainants have thus established a *prima facie* case asserting that the Respondents lack rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents did not submit any evidence or arguments to challenge the Complainants assertions.

Accordingly, the Complainants have satisfied the requirements of the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Bad faith under the Policy is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. According to paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be evidence of registration and use in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

- (ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, the 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 as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The Complainants ascertained its rights over the VULKAN trademarks in several jurisdictions. The dates of registration of the Complainants trademarks significantly precede the dates of registration of the disputed domain names.

As mentioned in the analysis of the first element, most of the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainants trademarks in their entirety, some constitute a typosquatted version of the Complainants trademarks, and some incorporate the abbreviation "VLK". Through the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve, the Respondents have impersonated the Complainants, which constitutes bad faith. Internet users who encounter said websites may believe that they are dealing with the Complainant, or with websites somehow endorsed, authorized, or operated by the Complainants (see section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); see also *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Domain Administrator, Registrant of iqosatismaganiz.com (apiname com) / Anl Girgin, Teknoloji Sarayi*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0466](#); *Self-Portrait IP Limited v. Franklin Kelly, supra*; and *Friedman and Soliman Enterprises, LLC v. Gary Selesko, M&B Relocation and Referral, LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0800](#)).

The typosquatting conduct of the Respondents amount to bad faith registration of the disputed domain names (see *Lexar Media, Inc. v. Michael Huang*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-1039](#); *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Longo*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0816](#); *Admiral Group Plc and EUI Limited v. Cimpress Schweiz, Cimpress Schweiz GmbH*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2017-0043](#); *MouseSavers, Inc. v. Mr. Henry Tsung d/b/a www.wwwmousesavers.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-1034](#); and *Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co. KG v. Martin Hughes <boehringer-ingelheim.com>*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1546](#)).

Taking the above into consideration, as well as the fact that the Respondents have targeted the Complainants, its services, and its clients, it is clear that the Respondents knew about the Complainants and its trademarks when the disputed domain names were registered. This conduct constitutes opportunistic bad faith registration under the Policy (see section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); see also *L'Oréal v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0149511181 / Jerry Peter*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1937](#); *Gilead Sciences Ireland UC / Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Domain Maybe For Sale c/o Dynadot*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0980](#); and *Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co. KG v. Marius Graur* WIPO Case No. [D2019-0208](#)).

The evidence submitted by the Complainants shows that the Respondents have attempted to attract Internet users to their websites for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondents' websites, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy (see *1IQ PTY LTD v. 1337 Services LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-2156](#); and *Facebook, Inc., WhatsApp Inc. v. Wisdom King, Wizindo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2517](#)).

Another indicator of bad faith is the pattern of abusive registrations in which the Respondents have been involved. The Respondents were also the Respondents in the following cases: *Dareos Ltd. and Dareos Inc. v. Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Anastasia Voloshina, Alexander Strunin, Natalya Pladzidina, Nikolay Sharov*; *Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Aleksey Petrov, Ivan Ivanov; Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd.*; *Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) / Nikolay Nefedov, IT. Main, supra*; *Dareos Ltd, Dareos Inc. v. Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd., Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com / Aleksandr Strunin, Anastasiya Voloshina, Yuriy Sharov, Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Anastasia Voloshina, Svetlana Sboychikova, Natalya Pladzidina, Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) / Nikolay Nefedov, IT. Main, Novolux*

Services Limitada, Bonostar Limited, supra; and Dareos Ltd., Dareos Inc. v. Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd.; Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Andrey Daviduk; Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Natalya Pladzinina; Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Alexander Strunin; Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Maria Hanina; Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Svetlana Sboychikova; Private Whois, Global Domain Privacy Services Inc. / Anastasia Voloshina; and ?????????? ??????????, supra. These cases also involve the Complainants trademarks. This pattern further supports a finding of bad faith according to article 4(b)(ii) of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 3.1.2).

The abovementioned facts show that not only the Respondents registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, but also, that the Respondents have been using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names, <casino-vulcan.win>, <cazinovulkan777.website>, <club-russian-vulkan.online>, <club-vulcan-platinum.online>, <sms-vulcan.com>, <vip-vulcan-clubs.com>, <vip-vulcans-club.com>, <vlkmillion.xyz>, <vulcancazino.xyz>, <vulcan-club.website>, <vulcan-connection.com>, <vulcan-deluxe.uno>, <vulcan-grand-vip.com>, <vulcan-lev.uno>, <vulcan-million.club>, <vulcan-prestige.uno>, <vulkan-all-games.space>, <vulkan-azart-games.site>, <vulkan-bitcoin-casino.club>, <vulkan-champion.website>, <vulkandeluxe-app.website>, <vulkandeluxe-bonus.site>, <vulkandeluxe-mobile.space>, <vulkandeluxe-money.uno>, <vulkandeluxe-registration.xyz>, <vulkan-deluxe.site>, <vulkandeluxe-site.website>, <vulkandeluxe-zerkalo.xyz>, <vulkandeluxe777.club>, <vulkan-download.club>, <vulkan-emulators.club>, <vulkan-for-free.club>, <vulkan-full-version.site>, <vulkan-game-udacha.com>, <vulkangrand-download.website>, <vulkangrand-mobile.site>, <vulkan-igrovie-avtomaty.club>, <vulkan-king.uno>, <vulkan-olimp.website>, <vulkan-on-money.uno>, <vulkan-on-real.xyz>, <vulkanplatinum-app.site>, <vulkanplatinum-bonus.club>, <vulkanplatinum-club.website>, <vulkanplatinum-mobile.online>, <vulkanplatinum-money.website>, <vulkanplatinum-site.site>, <vulkanplatinum-vhod.xyz>, <vulkanplatinum-zerkalo.uno>, <vulkanplatinum777.space>, <vulkanpobeda-bonuses.xyz>, <vulkanpobeda-zerkalo.uno>, <vulkanprestige-bonus.online>, <vulkanprestige-download.uno>, <vulkanprestige-promokod.club>, <vulkanprestige-zerkalo.space>, <vulkan-prilozhenie.online>, <vulkanrussia-app.xyz>, <vulkanrussia-bonus.uno>, <vulkanrussia-club.online>, <vulkanrussia-mobile.site>, <vulkanrussia-money.online>, <vulkanrussia-registration.space>, <vulkanrussia-site.xyz>, <vulkanrussia-vhod.club>, <vulkanrussia777.website>, <vulkanslots-casino.uno>, <vulkan-slots-free.site>, <vulkan-win50.online>, <vulkan-zal.space>, <vulkan-24.uno>, <vulkan777-slots.club>, <wulcan-club-platinum.club>, <wulcan-grand.site>, <wulcan-mobile.online>, <wulkancasino.uno>, <24-wulkan.club> and <vip-slots-vulcan.net> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Kiyoshi Tsuru/

Kiyoshi Tsuru

Sole Panelist

Date: July 6, 2022