

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Moonlite N.V. v. Egor Prosvirnin  
Case No. D2024-3721

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Moonlite N.V., Curaçao, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Gabnys.Gabnienė, Lithuania.

The Respondent is Egor Prosvirnin, Greece.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <leon-eu.com> is registered with Danesco Trading Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 13, 2024. On September 13, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 23, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 30, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 3, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 23, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 24, 2024. On October 29, 2024, due to an apparent issue with the notification, the Center granted the Respondent a ten-day period in which to indicate whether it wished to participate to this proceeding. No communication was received from the Respondent.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on November 15, 2024. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Curaçao, Netherlands (Kingdom of the) operating in the gambling field, and owning the following trademark registration for LEON:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003148764, registered on May 6, 2016.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, being "www.leon.bet" its main website.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on May 11, 2024, and it is inactive.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark LEON.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has no registered trademarks for "leon" and the disputed domain was created only to confuse users who are seeking the Complainant's services.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Respondent is trying to unfairly use the Complainant's trademark to confuse customers, which qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

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](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "eu" preceded by a hyphen, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to

come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Panel notes, in particular, that the Respondent has not shown that it registered the disputed domain name in connection with any non-trademark related meaning of the terms it comprises rather than in reference to the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the Panel has undertaken limited independent research in accordance with paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has ascertained that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website offering to download an app and displaying the Complainant's trademark and gambling-related content.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark LEON in the gambling field is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As regards the use of the disputed domain name, currently being inactive, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark in the gambling field, the nature of the disputed domain name (which includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the geographic term "eu" preceded by a hyphen), the previous use to which the disputed domain name has been put, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 name, <leon-eu.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Edoardo Fano/*

**Edoardo Fano**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 17, 2024