



मध्य प्रदेश MADHYA PRADESH

DF 515826

BEFORE THE ARBITRATOR RAJESH BISARIA

UNDER THE

.IN DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (INDRP)

[NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)]

ARBITRAL AWARD

Date-13.02.2026

Disputed Domain Name: [www. parimatch.pro.in](http://www.parimatch.pro.in)

INDRP Case No -2056

THE PARTIES

(1) The Complainant is Rillius Holding Limited. Address at Spyrou Kyprianou, 120, 3rd floor, Mesa Geitonia, 4004, Limassol, Cyprus.

The Respondent is Velora Dynamics LTD House of Francis, Room 403 ile Du Port, Mahe, 000 (SC)





मध्य प्रदेश MADHYA PRADESH

DF 515827

THE DOMAIN NAME AND REGISTRAR

- (2)
 - (a) This dispute concerns to the domain name **www. parimatch.pro.in**
 - (b) According to the WHOIS search utility of the .IN Registry. The Registration Date is 16 April 2023, Registrar of the disputed domain name is Netim Sarl, and the Registrant is Velora Dynamics LTD.
This was registered on 16.04.2023

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

(3)

The NIXI appointed RAJESH BISARIA as Arbitrator from its panel as per paragraph 5(b) of INDRP Rules of procedure	17.11.2025
Arbitral proceedings were commenced by sending notice to Respondent through e-mail as per paragraph 5(c) of INDRP Rules of Procedure, marking a copy of the same to Complainant's authorized representative and NIXI.	17.11.2025



Due date of submission of Statement of Claim by Complainant (instructed by mail dated 17.11.2025)	28.11.2025
Complainant 's response by submitting their Statement of Claim to AT- Soft copy Hard copy	06.12.2025 24.01.2026
Complainant 's response by submitting their Statement of Claim along with all annexures to Respondent- Soft Copy and Hard Copy- Complainant sent the copy of complaint along with all annexures to Respondent vide their mail dated 06.12.2025 (03:51PM) and stated that - <i>'To Respondent, Velora Dynamics LTD, We have sent you a physical copy of our complaint along with all the annexures A to F, via Courier by Indian Post, for which we have attached herewith the courier receipt for record and reference. Further, we also attached a soft copy of the complaint with the copy of the Annexures A to F, which is our second service of the Complaint and Annexure A to F, to you by email.'</i> The complete set of complaint was sent by Speed post with tracking no- RG561201185IN	06.12.2025
Due date of submission of Statement of Defense by Respondent as instructed by AT mail dated 17.11.2025 and 11.01.2026	09.12.2025 17.12.2025
Respondent's response by submitting their Statement of Defense against the due date of submission as 17.12.2025 Soft Copy and Hard Copy- Respondent vide his mail dated 08.12.2025 (02:28PM) and stated that - <i>'Hello, dear All, All your so-called certified documents are incredibly difficult to read. The formatting is terrible, and worst of all, even after multiple attempts to read everything, I still don't understand what you want from me. Is this a copyright or trademark</i>	08.12.2025



<p><i>infringement? The documents are a complete mess, impossible to extract anything constructive from. If there is a violation, send me the relevant trademark ownership document, and I'll respond with a document confirming the right to use it from my partners. That's all. Why this chaos?</i></p> <p><i>Thank you for your attention, and all the best.'</i></p> <p>This was the only communication from the Respondent but they failed to file the soft copy and hard copy of Statement of Defense</p>	
Complainant's response by submitting their Rejoinder	Not required
<p>AT by their mail dated 11.01.2026 stated and informed all concerning that- Respondent was directed to file the Soft copy (PDF & Editable) and the Hard copy of 'Reply of the said complete complaint (Statement of Defense)' on or before 09.12.2025. Looking to the delay in filing the complaint by the complainant, this date extended to 17.12.2025. But Respondent failed to file the same by extended date and even by today. Respondent has also not filed any application for the grant of extension of time for this submission. Since sufficient opportunity was given to Respondent to submit their pleading, therefore their right to submit the same is stand forfeited and no further opportunity shall be granted in this regard. The proceeding of this case is kept closed for award and the matter would be decided ex-parte on the basis of the documents on record with this tribunal as per INDRP policy.</p>	11.01.2026
The language of the proceedings	English

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

(4) The Complainant:

The Complainant in this arbitration proceeding is Rillius Holding Limited. Address at Spyrou Kyprianou, 120, 3rd floor, Mesa Geitonia, 4004, Limassol, Cyprus.



The Complainant's authorized representative in this administrative proceeding is:

The Complainant is represented by its authorized representative, Mahendra Parmar, Kinjal Bhatt, Harun Shaikh, Shoeb Masodi, Advocate, Agent/ Attorneys of M&P IP PROTECTORS. Address at A/803, Premium House, Ashram Road, Near Gandhi Gram Metro Station, Ellisbridge, Ahmedabad, Gujarat-380009, India.

The Complainant's preferred method of communication directed to the Complainant in this administrative proceeding is:

Medium: Not provided
 Address: Not provided
 Concerned Person's Name: Not provided

(5) The Respondent:

Velora Dynamics LTD , House of Francis, Room 403 ile Du Port, Mahe, 000 (SC)
 Email: pauludoh001@gmail.com , Phone No. +48.560686162

(6) Complainant's Activities:

- a. The Complainant and its predecessor incorporated the business in the name of



“ / PARIMATCH” in the year 1994. The Complainant and its predecessor, since the adoption of the brand, trade mark, trading style, and



name of the online platform “ / PARIMATCH”
(Hereinafter referred to as the said Trademark/ Trade name/ Brand name/ Domain name) have been marketing, advertising and doing publicity activity across the globe and has been spending a tremendous amount of money, time, and resources for Trademarks protection across the world.



- b. The Complainant's brand, trademark, trade name, and trading style



“ / **PARIMATCH**” is associated with a well-known and highly innovative online platform specializing in gaming and sports betting. Over the years, the Complainant and its predecessor have successfully evolved the business from a traditional bookmaker operating through physical locations into a state-of-the-art online sports betting platform. Today, the platform serves over 25 million customers worldwide, demonstrating its global reach and strong reputation in the industry.



- c. The Trademark “ / **PARIMATCH**” serves as the Complainant’s trademark, trading style, and domain name, and has been used as such by the Complainant and its predecessors. The “**PARIMATCH**” brand has grown into one of the top 10 international platforms in the sports betting, gambling, and gaming industries, with active operations in over 10 countries. The Complainant has significantly expanded its presence in the online gaming sector and now operates an extensive international network comprising more than 400 business units, with key offices located in Cyprus, Kazakhstan, and other jurisdictions. To support its global operations and brand protection strategy, the Complainant has registered multiple domain names incorporating the



“ / **PARIMATCH**” trademark to serve major international markets. These domains include, but are not limited to: <https://www.parimatch.co.uk/> , <https://parimatch.kz/>, <https://parimatch.tj/>, <https://parimatch.co.tz/sw/>, <https://parimatch.com.cy/> . Copies of the Complainant’s website pages are annexed hereto as **Annexure D**.



- d. The Complainant, under the “ / **PARIMATCH**” brand, has established a strong global presence through numerous high-profile sports



sponsorships and partnerships. Internationally, the brand is the official partner of the **Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC)** in Asia and an official sponsor of various football, basketball, and hockey leagues and clubs globally. The Complainant's platform **PARIMATCH** offers 24/7 sports betting, live-in-play options, real-time sports news, statistics, and analytics.

- <https://www.yugmarg.com/news/5345-parimatch-news-announced-as-lead-sponsor-of-isl%E2%80%99s-atk-mohun-bagan-fc.aspx>
- <https://www.ufc.com/news/ufc-25-beast-mode>
- <https://www.juventus.com/en/news/articles/parimatch-official-partner-of-juventus>
- <https://www.gamingintelligence.com/marketing/sponsorship/20108-7-parimatch-seals-nottingham-forest-betting-partnership/>
- <https://www.ufc.com/news/ufc-names-parimatch-official-sportsbook-and-betting-partner-asia>
- <https://fintechbloom.com/parimatch-announces-exclusive-partnership-with-sunrisers-eastern-cape-as-title-sponsor/>

The above-provided links that support the above submission of the Complainant are hereto marked and annexed as **Annexure- E**.



- e. The Complainant's trademark " / PARIMATCH" has been extensively promoted and advertised across various media channels, both online and offline. To enhance global brand recognition, the Complainant has consistently engaged high-profile sports personalities and celebrities as brand ambassadors, such as legendary boxer **Mike Tyson** and mixed martial artist **Conor McGregor**.

The images of the advertisements and promotions for the Complainant's



said Trademark " / PARIMATCH" brand with



the said Celebrities and Sports Icons are annexed herewith as Annexure-E.

(7) Complainant's Trade Marks and Domain Names:

1. REGISTERED AND APPLIED TRADEMARKS IN INDIA.

Sr. No.	Trademark	Application No.	Goods
1.		4552801	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status
2.		4681871	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status.
3.		5168111	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status
4.		5168112	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status
5.	PARIMATCH	5246045	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as



			mentioned in the Trademarks Status
6.		5247904	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status.
7.		5249235	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status.
8.		5249223	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status.
9.		5244715	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status.
10.		5244714	All Goods/ services covered in class 35 and class 41 as mentioned in the Trademarks Status.



Hereto marked and annexed are the copies of the Indian Trademarks Application STATUS applied by the Complainant as **Annexure- B.**



2. REGISTERED AND APPLIED FOR TRADEMARKS OUTSIDE INDIA, GLOBALLY.

Sr. No.	Trade Mark	Country	Application No.
1.		Ukraine	m202114566
2.		Armenia	1631804
3.		Australia	1631804
4.		Azerbaijan	1631804
5.		Brazil	1631804
6.		Canada	1631804
7.		Switzerland	1631804
8.		Cyprus	1631804
9.		United Kingdom	1631804







10.		Georgia	1631804
11.		Ghana	1631804
12.		Kenya	1631804
13.		Kazakhstan	1631804
14.		Mexico	1631804
15.		Norway	1631804
16.		New Zealand	1631804
17.		Tajikistan	1631804
18.		Uzbekistan	1631804
19.	PM	Ukraine	264880
20.	PM	Armenia	1632240
21.	PM	Australia	1632240

22.	PM	Azerbaijan	1632240
23.	PM	Brazil	1632240
24.	PM	Canada	1632240
25.	PM	Switzerland	1632240
26.	PM	Cyprus	1632240
27.	PM	United Kingdom	1632240
28.	PM	Georgia	1632240
29.	PM	Ghana	1632240
30.	PM	Kenya	1632240
31.	PM	Kazakhstan	1632240
32.	PM	Mexico	1632240
33.	PM	Norway	1632240
34.	PM	New Zealand	1632240
35.	PM	Tajikistan	1632240
36.	PM	Uzbekistan	1632240
37.		Ukraine	m202114562
38.		Armenia	1631803




39.		Australia	1631803
40.		Azerbaijan	1631803
41.		Brazil	1631803
42.		Canada	1631803
43.		Switzerland	1631803
44.		Cyprus	1631803
45.		United Kingdom	1631803
46.		Georgia	1631803
47.		Ghana	1631803
48.		Kenya	631803




49.		Kazakhstan	631803
50.		Mexico	631803
51.		Norway	631803
52.		New Zealand	631803
53.		Tajikistan	631803
54.		Uzbekistan	631803
55.		Ukraine	n202114565
56.		Armenia	631802
57.		Australia	631802


58.		Azerbaijan	1631802
59.		Brazil	1631802
60.		Canada	1631802
61.		Switzerland	1631802
62.		Cyprus	1631802
63.		United Kingdom	1631802
64.		Georgia	1631802






65.		Ghana	1631802
66.		Kenya	1631802
67.		Kazakhstan	1631802
68.		Mexico	1631802
69.		Norway	1631802
70.		New Zealand	1631802
71.		Tajikistan	1631802



72.		Uzbekistan	1631802
73.		Ukraine	292005
74.		Armenia	1630589
75.		Australia	1630589
76.		Azerbaijan	1630589
77.		Brazil	1630589
78.		Canada	1630589

79.		Switzerland	630589
80.		Cyprus	630589
81.		United Kingdom	630589
82.		Georgia	630589
83.		Ghana	630589
84.		Kenya	630589
85.		Kazakhstan	630589

86.		Mexico	630589
87.		Norway	630589
88.		New Zealand	630589
89.		Tajikistan	630589
90.		Uzbekistan	630589
91.	PARIMATCH	Ukraine	291494
92.	PARIMATCH	Armenia	630588
93.	PARIMATCH	Australia	630588
94.	PARIMATCH	Azerbaijan	630588
95.	PARIMATCH	Brazil	630588
96.	PARIMATCH	Canada	630588



97.	PARIMATCH	Switzerland	630588
98.	PARIMATCH	Cyprus	630588
99.	PARIMATCH	United Kingdom	630588
100	PARIMATCH	Georgia	630588
101	PARIMATCH	Ghana	630588
102	PARIMATCH	Kenya	630588
103	PARIMATCH	Kazakhstan	630588
104	PARIMATCH	Mexico	630588
105	PARIMATCH	Norway	630588
106	PARIMATCH	New Zealand	630588
107	PARIMATCH	Tajikistan	630588
108	PARIMATCH	Uzbekistan	630588
109		Ukraine	288169
110		Armenia	580872
111		Australia	580872
112		Azerbaijan	580872

113		Brazil	580872
114		Canada	580872
115		Switzerland	580872
116		Cyprus	580872
117		United Kingdom	580872
118		Georgia	580872
119		Uganda	580872
120		Kenya	1580872
121		Kazakhstan	1580872
122		Mexico	1580872



123		Norway	1580872
124		New Zealand	1580872
125		Tajikistan	1580872
126		Uzbekistan	1580872
127		Ukraine	m202021500
128		Armenia	1580793
129		Australia	1580793
130		Azerbaijan	1580793






131		Brazil	.580793
132		Canada	.580793
133		Switzerland	.580793
134		Cyprus	.580793
135		United Kingdom	.580793
136		Georgia	.580793



137		Ghana	.580793
138		Kenya	.580793
139		Kazakhstan	.580793
140		Mexico	.580793
141		Norway	.580793
142		New Zealand	.580793



143		Tajikistan	580793
144		Uzbekistan	580793
145		Ukraine	m202007908
146		Kazakhstan	1572953
147		United Kingdom	1572953
148		Tajikistan	1572953
149		Uzbekistan	1572953
150		Ukraine	m202007906
151		Kazakhstan	1572438

152		United Kingdom	1572438
153		Tajikistan	1572438
154		Uzbekistan	1572438
155		Ukraine	M202007911
156		Kazakhstan	1572380
157		United Kingdom	1572380
158		Tajikistan	1572380
159		Uzbekistan	1572380



160		Ukraine	264882
161		Brazil	1552353
162		United Kingdom	1552353
163		Kenya	1552353
164		Mexico	1552353
165		Ukraine	m201825495
166		Tajikistan	1534393
167		Ukraine	m201825494

168	PARI MATCH	Armenia	1534210
169	PARI MATCH	Australia	1534210
170	PARI MATCH	Azerbaijan	1534210
171	PARI MATCH	Brazil	1534210
172	PARI MATCH	Canada	534210
173	PARI MATCH	Switzerland	534210
174	PARI MATCH	Cyprus	534210
175	PARI MATCH	United Kingdom	534210
176	PARI MATCH	Georgia	534210
177	PARI MATCH	Ghana	534210



178		Kenya	534210
179		Kazakhstan	534210
180		Mexico	534210
181		Norway	534210
182		New Zealand	534210
183		Tajikistan	534210
184		Uzbekistan	534210
185		Ireland	534210
186		Ukraine	178808
187		Azerbaija	298964
188		Curacao	298964

189		Cyprus	298964
190		Poland	298964
191		Romania	298964
192		Tajikistan	298964
193		Turkmeni stan	298964
194		Uzbekista	298964

The Complainant is the **legitimate, concurrent user and prior Registered proprietor** of the said trade mark in Ukraine across the world including India; and

since the adoption of the trade mark “  /
PARIMATCH”, the Complainant has been spending ample amount of money, time

and resources to protect the said trade mark “  /
PARIMATCH” along with its all the distinct associated features and variations.

Hereto marked and annexed are the copies of the status of the international trade mark Application before WIPO as Annexure-C.

(8) Respondent’s Identity and activities:

Respondent failed to submit their Statement of Defense, so his identity and activities are not clear.


 RAKESH BISARIA
 ARBITRATOR

(9) Response by Respondent:

The Respondent vide email dated 08.12.2025 submitted as below.

"Hello, dear All,

All your so-called certified documents are incredibly difficult to read. The formatting is terrible, and worst of all, even after multiple attempts to read everything, I still don't understand what you want from me. Is this a copyright or trademark infringement? The documents are a complete mess, impossible to extract anything constructive from. If there is a violation, send me the relevant trademark ownership document, and I'll respond with a document confirming the right to use it from my partners. That's all. Why this chaos?

Thank you for your attention, and all the best."

No Statement of Defense was filed.

(10) Rejoinder by Complainant:

Since the Respondent failed to submit their reply to the Complaint of Complainant, so Rejoinder was not required to be submitted by Complainant.

(11) Submissions of Documents by Complainant:

Complainant submitted Domain name complaint with pages 1 to 38 (words 4966) and annexure from A to F with 68 pages and Power of Attorney in 02 pages.

As per the INDRP Rules of Procedure, Clause 4(a) – *The (maximum) word limit shall be 5000 words for all pleadings individually (excluding annexure). Annexure shall not be more than 100 pages in total. Parties shall observe this rule strictly subject to Arbitrator's discretion.*

The Complainant submitted pleadings of 4966 words and Annexures of total 70 pages, which are as per the above norms of the INDRP Rules.

THE CONTENTIONS OF COMPLAINANT**(12) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights:****Submission by Complainant**

- (a) It is respectfully submitted that the disputed domain name "parimatch.pro.in" is identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known and

registered trademark “ /PARIMATCH”, in which the Complainant holds exclusive statutory and common law rights globally. Relying on the Rules and Procedure of INDRP (IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy), specifically mentioned in Clause-4 (a) of the .IN Dispute Resolution Policy, wherein the Respondent’s disputed domain name “parimatch.pro.in” wholly incorporates the Complainant’s prior used, prior registered, distinctive, well-known and reputed trademark “PARIMATCH”, which is identical and/ or confusingly similar to Complainant’s well-established and well-known House Mark ‘PARIMATCH’. It is pertinent to note that the Respondent’s alleged and mala fide act of using the entire trademark ‘PARIMATCH’, and merely adding a generic top-level domain ‘.pro’ which stands for ‘professional’, and a country-code ‘.in’ to come up with the disputed domain name ‘parimatch.pro.in’ is neither coincidental nor legitimate. The Respondent has engaged in a clear act of bad faith by using the identical trade name and creating a deceptive website that mirrors the Complainant’s official Website. It is pertinent to note that the Respondent’s alleged domain ‘parimatch.pro.in’ is not directly accessible in India, but accessible across the world. However, it can be accessed using VPNs, which makes it visible and accessible to Indian internet users as well. As a result, the Respondent’s mala fide use of the disputed domain name, which is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s well-known mark ‘PARIMATCH’, confuses and misleads internet users into believing that the disputed domain is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant. This has resulted in irreparable loss, damage to the Complainant’s reputation, loss of users, and loss of potential commercial opportunities, thereby causing substantial harm to the Complainant’s brand name, trade name, and trademark ‘PARIMATCH’.

- (b) Furthermore, the Respondent is unlawfully operating an integrated online payment system through its misleading platform, and upon downloading the endorsed mobile application PARIMATCH APPLICATION from disputed website and registering an account, the unknown users are enabled to access and play games online, using various public deposits via multiple payment methods, including Net Banking, Paytm, PhonePe, AstroPay, Bitcoin, and

others. By offering these payment options on a fraudulent website, the Respondent misleads genuine users into believing that their payments are being made to the well-known brand PARIMATCH. In reality, any amount paid by third parties is being fraudulently collected by the Respondent. This constitutes a serious offence of cyber fraud, cheating by personation, identity theft, as the innocent public is being misled, deceived, and exploited without their knowledge. The Respondent's actions not only cause financial harm to the public but also severely damage the Complainant's goodwill and trans-border reputation. Such misuse of the domain name is clear evidence of bad faith, and such matters should be resolved at the earliest, to prevent further harm to the well-established business of the Complaint under the name of PARIMATCH. Such malicious and unlawful conduct of the Respondent is an intentional attempt to trade off the Complainant's well-established reputation and goodwill, causing irreparable harm to the Complainant's Trade name/ Trademark/ brand name and deceiving the genuine customers and fans.

- (c) The Complainant relies upon the case of Burger King Corporation v/s Swapnil Patil and Others (I.A.17896/2023 & 17923/2023), decided by the Delhi High Court. Wherein, the defendants created fake websites using the 'Burger King' trademark and logos to offer fraudulent franchise opportunities. Unsuspecting individuals were duped into transferring large sums of money, including ₹2,65,000, to a fake account under the name "Burger King India Limited." The court found that the websites were created with the intent to deceive and generate unlawful financial gain by impersonating the brand online. The Delhi High Court passed strict orders to block the domains, freeze the bank accounts, and initiate a criminal investigation, recognizing the matter as a serious case of cyber fraud and cheating by personation. In this matter also, the Respondent has followed the same deceptive pattern, using the Complainant's trade name and an identical website layout to run a fake website and to make money by deceiving the genuine public/ unknown users. Any payments made by third parties through this platform are directly misappropriated by the Respondent, amounting to cyber fraud and criminal

acts. Just like the Burger King case, this is a deliberate act to exploit public trust and earn money illegally while damaging the Complainant's trans-border reputation and goodwill. Thus, urgent action must be taken to stop and prevent the Respondent from running fake websites under the well-known and well-established trade name/ trademark PARIMATCH.

(13) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name:

Submission by Complainant

(a) It is pertinent to note that the Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use or register the disputed domain name "parimatch.pro.in", or any mark, trade name, or domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known and widely recognized trademark " /PARIMATCH". Having secured prior statutory registrations and having continuously used the mark in connection with its business, the Complainant is the exclusive owner and registered proprietor of the said trademark "PARIMATCH". Thus, abiding by Clause 4 (b) of .IN the Dispute Resolution Policy, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests over the disputed domain name 'parimatch.pro.in'.

(b) It is respectfully submitted that the Respondent had prior knowledge of the complainant's well-known status and was aware of the Complainant's longstanding and well-established trademark "PARIMATCH", which has been in extensive and continuous use globally for decades. The Complainant has developed substantial goodwill and reputation in the mark "PARIMATCH" through its online platforms, trading style, and domain name registrations, which are used in multiple jurisdictions, across the Globe. The Complainant respectfully submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests whatsoever in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent is maliciously and unlawfully using the disputed domain, which infringes the Complainant's trademark rights and deceives the public. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's

unauthorized and malicious use of the Complainant's trademark, logo, and overall trade dress '' constitutes clear evidence of bad faith and a deliberate attempt to exploit the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's well-known and well-established Trademark 'PARIMATCH'.

- (c) Thus, the alleged acts of the Respondent have resulted in the infringement of the Complainant's rights and remedies. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name as:
- a. The Respondent has maliciously, with the intent to ride upon the goodwill of the Complainant's well-known brand PARIMATCH, registered and used the disputed domain name;
 - b. The Respondent is not commonly known by the domain name, and
 - c. The Respondent is using the domain name of the Complainant's Popular House mark 'PARIMATCH' to mislead users, to unfairly benefit from the Complainant's established brand, and to unlawfully hijack the well-known domain name of the Complainant 'PARIMATCH'.

(14) The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith:

Submission by Complainant

- (a) It is respectfully submitted that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name "parimatch.pro.in" in bad faith. The Respondent's actions constitute a deliberate and unlawful attempt to exploit the Complainant's well-known trademark " /PARIMATCH" for unlawful commercial gain. Such conduct clearly falls within the scope of bad faith registration and use as contemplated under Clause 4 (c) of .IN Dispute Resolution Policy. The Complainant's trademark "PARIMATCH" is a globally recognized and reputed mark in the field of online gaming and entertainment, having been promoted extensively through significant investments in marketing, celebrity endorsements, sports partnerships, and advertising campaigns across jurisdictions. As a result, the trademark enjoys substantial goodwill and widespread public recognition, particularly among internet users and millions of online gaming consumers.



- (b) The Respondent has deliberately used the house mark 'PARIMATCH' in the disputed domain name 'parimatch.pro.in', to ride upon the goodwill and well-known status of the Complainant's Trademark/ Trade name/ Brand name 'PARIMATCH'. This unlawful act of the Respondent has resulted in creating a false association or false relationship with the Complainant's well-known and well-established brand name/ Trademark/ Trade name 'PARIMATCH', causing existing users and potential customers to mistakenly and falsely believe that the Respondent's website is authorized, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant. Thus, such unethical and mala fide actions of the Respondent constitute serious domain name abuse, including cybersquatting, typo-squatting, domain hijacking and deliberate domain twinning. These acts not only infringe upon the Complainant's trademark rights but also give rise to false misrepresentation, thereby creating a substantial risk of consumer deception, fraud, data compromise, and unauthorized access to online gaming and betting platforms, causing irreparable harm to both the Complainant and unsuspecting users.
- (c) In light of these facts, the Respondent's mala fide and illegal conduct falls within the scope of Paragraph 4(c) of the .IN Dispute Resolution Policy, whereby the Respondent, intentionally and for financial gain, attempts to attract internet users by selling exactly same services, by preventing the trademark holder from using the corresponding domain name, by registering impugned domain name with the intent to disrupt the complainant's business, and by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's registered Trademark to attract the internet users. Such malicious conduct by the Respondent includes the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website whose layout, visual design, and colour scheme closely and deliberately mimic those of the Complainant's official website. This imitation creates a false impression of association or affiliation with the Complainant, further evidencing the Respondent's bad faith and intent to deceive users. It is pertinent to note that there is no legitimate reason for the Respondent to register or use a domain name containing the Complainant's well-known mark 'PARIMATCH'. Thus, the Respondent's actions constitute a mala fide intention

to use and to register the impugned domain. Therefore, the Complainant respectfully requests that the domain name “parimatch.pro.in” be cancelled or transferred to the Complainant.

(d) Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademark registration or has applied for any mark incorporating “PARIMATCH”. The adoption of the domain name by the Respondent appears to be a deliberate and malicious attempt to exploit the goodwill and brand recognition of the Complainant’s well-established and well-recognized trademark for commercial gain, thereby misleading the public and potentially diverting internet fans and others. Such an act of the Respondent constitutes bad faith, an illegal act, and a clear abuse of the domain name registration system. In this regard, the Complainant has produced copies of website pages of the Respondent, accessible through the Disputed Domain ‘parimatch.pro.in’ as already mentioned in Annexure- A.

(e) Thus, the above-mentioned alleged acts of the Respondent clearly fall under bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name, as evidenced by the following circumstances;

- a. The Respondent appears to have acquired the domain primarily to sell or transfer it to the Complainant or a competitor for undue gain;
- b. The registration seems to have a mala fide intention to prevent and hijack the Complainant’s well-established and well-known domain ‘PARIMATCH’;
- c. The Respondent has deliberately created a likelihood of confusion to attract internet users by misusing the Complainant’s well-known Trademark ‘PARIMATCH’ and;
- d. The domain has been registered with the intention to disrupt the business of the Complainant, who is a legitimate proprietor competitor. These actions clearly establish bad faith under the INDRP.

- (f) The complainant relies upon the case of Moonshine Technology (P) Ltd. v. Tictok Skill Games (P) Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine Del 296, wherein, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court granted a John Doe order to protect the intellectual property rights of the Baazi Group against rogue websites engaged in cybersquatting, unauthorized use of trademarks, and unlawful online gaming platforms. The Court held that the defendants were misusing the plaintiff's registered trademarks to divert traffic, deceive users, and tarnish the brand's reputation, and accordingly directed domain registrars to suspend access and disclose details of the infringing domain name registrants. The Court emphasized that such misuse amounts to trademark infringement, unfair trade practice, and causes irreparable harm to the trademark owner. The Complainant submits that the present case is of a similar nature, involving bad faith registration, deceptive use of the Complainant's trademark in a domain name, and prays for similar protection as granted in the above precedent.
- (g) The complainant relies upon the case of Morgan Stanley v. Bharat Jain (2010), where the complainant filed a domain dispute under the .IN Dispute Resolution Policy for the disputed domain 'morganstanleybank.co.in', which was found to be confusingly similar to MORGAN STANLEY's domain name 'morganstanley.in'. The respondent had no legitimate rights or interest in the disputed domain name. On the basis of bad faith registration and taking the coined word 'MORGAN STANLEY', the Panel concluded that the domain was registered in bad faith. As a result, the domain was ordered to be transferred to Morgan Stanley, the Complainant. Referring to the above Judgment, in the present case, the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name 'parimatch.pro.in', which incorporates the Complainant's coined and well-known trademark 'PARIMATCH', despite having no legitimate rights or interests in the same. Similar to the facts in the Morgan Stanley case, the Respondent's registration appears to have been made in bad faith, with the intent to ride on the goodwill of the Complainant and to cause harassment. This conduct clearly amounts to acts of Cyber-squatting, Cyber-twinning, and misuse aimed at exploiting or damaging the Complainant's brand reputation.

Accordingly, the Complainant is entitled to seek the transfer of the disputed domain to safeguard its trademark rights and prevent further abuse.

(h) It is pertinent to note that the Complainant is a well-known and reputable brand, enjoying substantial goodwill and recognition in the market. The Complainant has actively and successfully protected its Intellectual Property Rights against misuse by third parties. In the past as well, the Complainant has initiated domain name dispute proceedings under both the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), and in each of these cases, the decision has been rendered in the complainant's favour. These cases involved unauthorized and bad faith registrations of domain names identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. A summary of such decided cases is provided below:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Authority	Disputed Domain	Parties	Decision
1.	INDRP Case No. 1605	NIXI	www.parimatch247.in	Complainant- Rillius Holding Limited Respondent- Saurabh Shyara	Amicable settlement
2.	D2022- 2897	WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center	parimatchbook11.com	Complainant- Rillius Holding Limited Respondent- ishu sahu	Domain was transferred to the complainant



3.	INDRP Case No. 1608	NIXI	Pokermatch.in	Complainant- Inplace N.V. Respondent- Sergey Yaromich	Domain was transferred to the complainant.
4.	DUA2024- 0009	WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Centre	casino- parimatch.com.ua	Complainant Respondent- Respondent is Буров Богдан Вікторович, Ukraine. (Burov Bohdan Viktorovych)	Domain was transferred to the complainant.

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS:**(15) Submission of Complainant**

The Complainant respectfully submits that no legal proceedings have been commenced, are pending, or have been terminated between the Complainant and the Respondent in relation to the disputed domain name as of the date of filing this Complaint. However, the Complainant reserves the right to initiate appropriate legal action against the Respondent, based on the findings, outcome, and observations arising out of the present proceedings, at a suitable and appropriate stage.

REMEDY SOUGHT:**(16) Submission of Complainant**

In view of the facts, legal grounds, and evidence presented, the Complainant respectfully prays that the Hon'ble Panel direct the immediate transfer of the disputed domain name "parimatch.pro.in" to the Complainant. The complainant



prays for an order to permanently suspend or block the disputed domain name, in the interest of protecting the public and upholding the statutory and common law rights of the Complainant. The Complainant further seeks an award of costs incurred in these proceedings and compensation for the damages and hardship caused by the Respondent's bad faith, unlawful, and unethical actions. The Complainant submits to the final and binding resolution of this dispute through arbitration under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, as amended, and any applicable rules or procedures thereunder.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS:

- (17)** After going through the correspondence, this AT comes to the conclusion that the Arbitral Tribunal was properly constituted and appointed as per Clause 5 of the INDRP Rules of Procedure and Respondent has been notified of the complaint of the Complainant.
- (18)** Respondent was given enough opportunity to submit Reply of Complaint (Statement of Defense) latest by 09.12.2025 and thereafter by 17.12.2025. But Respondent failed to submit the same within said time limit; therefore, the Respondent right to submit the SOD was forfeited and the award was published on merits and on the basis of the documents on record with this tribunal as per INDRP policy.
- (19)** Under Clause 4, of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolutions policy (INDRP), the Complainant has filed a complaint to .IN Registry on the following premises:
- (a) the Registrant's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a Name, Trademark or Service Mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
 - (b) the Registrant's has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the domain name; and
 - (c) The Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used either in bad faith or for illegal/unlawful purpose.



- (20) The Registrant's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a Name, Trademark or Service Mark in which the Complainant has rights:**

Facts & Findings

On the basis of the referred Awards of WIPO & INDRP cases, above mentioned facts by Complainant and non-submission of Statement of Defense, the Arbitral Tribunal concludes that the Complainant has established Clause 4(a) of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) and accordingly satisfies the said Clause of policy.

- (21) The Registrant's has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the domain name:**

Facts & Findings

On the basis of the referred Awards of WIPO & INDRP cases, above mentioned facts by Complainant and non-submission of Statement of Defense, the Arbitral Tribunal concludes that the Complainant has established Clause 4(b) of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) and accordingly satisfies the said Clause of policy.

- (22) The Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used either in bad faith or for illegal/unlawful purpose:**

Facts & Findings

On the basis of the referred Awards of WIPO & INDRP cases, above mentioned facts by Complainant and non-submission of Statement of Defense, the Arbitral Tribunal concludes that the Complainant has established Clause 4(c) of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) and accordingly satisfies the said Clause of policy.



(23) As per Clause 5(e) INDRP Rules of Procedure the Award of this case is published within the extended period of additional 30 days due to the non-availability of the stamp paper in the market.

(24) **ARBITRAL AWARD**

I, **Rajesh Bisaria**, Arbitrator, after examining and considering the pleadings and documentary evidence produced before and having applied mind and considering the facts, documents and other evidence with care, do hereby publish award in accordance with Clause 5, 17 and 18 of the INDRP Rules of Procedure and Clause 11 of .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), as follows:

Arbitral Tribunal orders that the disputed domain name

“www. parimatch.pro.in”

be forthwith TRANSFERRED from Respondent to Complainant.

Further AT takes an adverse view on the bad faith registration of impugned domain by the Respondent and to restrict the act for future misuse, fine of Rs. 10000/- (Rs. Ten thousand only) is being imposed on the Respondent, as per the provision in clause 11 of .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) to be paid to .IN Registry for putting the administration unnecessary work.

AT has made and signed this Award at Bhopal (India) on 13.02.2026 (Thirteenth Day of February, Two Thousand Twenty-Six).

Place: Bhopal (India)

Date: 13.02.2026



(RAJESH BISARIA)

Arbitrator