

# DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE

**D00012650**

## Decision of Independent Expert

Newcote International Limited  
Victor Chandler International Limited

and

Ms Sally Hill

### 1. The Parties:

Lead Complainant: Newcote International Limited  
Suite 205 A  
Saffrey Square  
Bank Lane & Bay Street  
PO Box N-4244  
Nassau  
Bahamas

Second Complainant: Victor Chandler International Limited  
143 Main Street  
Gibraltar

Respondent: Ms Sally Hill  
3 West Hall Court  
Leeds  
LS16 9EQ  
United Kingdom

### 2. The Domain Names:

betvictorbet.co.uk  
betvictorbetting.co.uk  
betvictorbingo.co.uk  
betvictorcasino.co.uk  
betvictorgames.co.uk  
betvictoronline.co.uk  
betvictorpoker.co.uk  
betvictorslots.co.uk  
betvictorsport.co.uk  
betvictorsports.co.uk  
betvictorwebsite.co.uk

(the Domain Names)

### **3. Procedural History:**

I can confirm that I am independent of each of the parties. To the best of my knowledge and belief, there are no facts or circumstances, past or present, or that could arise in the foreseeable future, that need be disclosed as they might be of a such a nature as to call in to question my independence in the eyes of one or both of the parties.

25 March 2013 17:07	Dispute received
26 March 2013 10:34	Complaint validated
26 March 2013 11:16	Notification of complaint sent to parties
16 April 2013 02:30	Response reminder sent
18 April 2013 13:35	Response received
18 April 2013 13:36	Notification of response sent to parties
23 April 2013 02:30	Reply reminder sent
26 April 2013 08:15	Reply received
26 April 2013 08:16	Notification of reply sent to parties
26 April 2013 08:17	Mediator appointed
01 May 2013 14:30	Mediation started
05 June 2013 10:40	Mediation failed
05 June 2013 10:53	Close of mediation documents sent
14 June 2013 11:05	Mediation failed
14 June 2013 11:06	Close of mediation documents sent
18 June 2013 11:53	Expert decision payment received

### **4. Factual Background**

Newcote International Limited (the Lead Complainant) and Victor Chandler International Limited (the Second Complainant) are part of the Victor Chandler group of companies (the Group), which originates from Victor Chandler Limited, a UK company incorporated on 22 May 1946.

Betting services in the UK have been offered under the VICTOR CHANDLER name since 1946. Gambling facilities have been provided since the 1960s. Since the 1990s, the Group has had offices and betting shops around the world.

The Group also operates numerous online betting platforms, including under the VICTOR CHANDLER and now BETVICTOR names.

The Group has invested heavily in direct and indirect marketing of the VICTOR CHANDLER name, including sponsorship of high profile sports players, clubs and events.

In January 2012, the Group rebranded the VICTOR CHANDLER online betting platform to BETVICTOR, supported by a £4 million TV advertising campaign comprising over 1,200 adverts and 500 press ads.

The Lead Complainant owns a CTM trade mark registration for the mark BETVICTOR filed on 17 December 2010 (registration number: 009608332).

The Group owns numerous domain names incorporating its BETVICTOR mark that provide online gambling and gaming services, including betvictor.com and betvictor.co.uk., both registered on 18 September 2002 in the name of the Second Complainant. Both resolve to the Complainants' website at www.betvictor.com. The Complainants trade heavily

through their domain names and in 2012, they attracted an average of 280,000 unique website users each month.

The Lead Complainant also owns registered rights in marks consisting of or including the name VICTOR CHANDLER e.g CTM word mark, VICTOR CHANDLER INTERNATIONAL filed on 18 November 1998, (registration number: 000989111) and CTM word mark, VICTOR CHANDLER filed on 23 November 2004, (registration number: 004140737).

Companies in the Group also own a number of domain names incorporating the mark VICTOR e.g. betvictor.com referred to earlier, victor.com registered on 22 June 1994, victorchandler.com registered on 28 August 1997, victorpoker.com registered on 5 June 2001 and victorbet.co.uk registered on 10 January 2002.

The Respondent is an entrepreneur and business woman. She is the managing director of SGE Corporation Limited (SGE) which is responsible for a number of successful businesses including 'Switch Gas and Electric', 'SGE Loans' and 'SGE Games'

SGE was incorporated in September 2011 but the SGE Group has been trading since January 2010. All trading by the SGE Group is carried out online and through telesales and its combined turnover is in excess of £4 million.

The Respondent registered the Domain Names on 24 June 2012.

Hereafter, unless the context otherwise dictates, no distinction will be made between Lead and Second Complainant, who will be referred to jointly as Complainants.

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **The Complainants**

- The Complainants have unregistered rights in the marks VICTOR and VICTOR CHANDLER which have accrued through their provision of betting and gaming services under such marks for over 60 years, high profile marketing campaigns and sponsorship activities.
- The Domain Names encompass and are highly similar to the CTM trade mark, BETVICTOR. They are also highly similar to 35 of the Complainants' domain names including betvictor.com, betvictor.co.uk and betvictor.org.
- The Complainants have a significant and famous reputation in their trade marks. Use of the Domain Names by the Respondent infringes the Complainants' rights in the BETVICTOR mark.
- The Complainants have not consented to the Respondent's use of the mark BETVICTOR and the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the Domain Names. In particular, the Respondent is not associated in any way with the Complainants, has not made any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the Domain Names in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services and does not operate the websites to which the Domain Names resolve in tribute to, or in criticism of, the Complainants.
- The Complainants' trade mark rights subsisted and were valid as at the date of registration of the Domain Names (24 June 2012) and given the Complainants' extensive press advertising campaign in January 2012, it must have been clear to

the Respondent, at the date of registration, that consumers would associate the Domain Names with the Complainants. This is especially so when its pattern of domain name registrations (referred to below) is taken into account. This conferred an unfair advantage on the Respondent.

- No goods or services can be purchased directly from the websites to which the Domain Names resolve as they do not appear to be functional. There is no evidence whatsoever of any actual or contemplated good faith use by the Respondent.
- The Complainants contend that there are no circumstances in which use of the Domain Names by the Respondent could ever be in good faith. They say that any use will inevitably be unauthorised and confusing. Consumers would automatically believe that the Domain Names are connected with the Complainants, and may believe that any services that might be offered on a website accessed through the Domain Names are an extension of the Complainants' offering.
- It must have been clear to the Respondent when she registered the Domain Names that their registration and use would unfairly disrupt the business of the Complainants. Indeed, the Complainants say that the Domain Names do unfairly disrupt their business by directing traffic away from the Complainants' websites, by infringing their trade marks, and preventing the Complainants from policing their brand and managing their customers' experience.
- The Respondent is not commonly known by the BETVICTOR mark. The Respondent is not licensed by the Complainants to use the BETVICTOR mark and is not an authorised vendor, supplier, or distributor of the Complainants' goods and services. As far as the Complainants are aware, the Domain Names are not intended for, and have never been used for genuine commercial use.
- In all the circumstances, it can be assumed that the Domain Names were registered for the purposes of transferring them to the Complainants or to a competitor, for valuable consideration, or as blocking registrations.
- The Respondent's use of the mark BETVICTOR dilutes the distinctiveness of the Complainants' marks and the strength of the marks as indications of origin. The Complainants have no control over the quality of the services the Respondent or third parties may advertise on the Respondent's website. Accordingly, any use of the Domain Names made by the Respondent would automatically take unfair advantage of and be unfairly detrimental to the reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainants' marks.
- The Respondent is using the Domain Names in a way which is likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that they are registered to, operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the Complainants. The Complainants assert that the current use of the Domain Names is tantamount to passing off the websites to which they resolve as being the Complainants, or being operated in association with them or with their consent.
- The Respondent is a serial cybersquatter. The registration of 11 domain names on the same day, all of which incorporate the BETVICTOR trade mark, can be no coincidence. The Domain Names combine the Complainants' unique and distinctive BETVICTOR mark with subject matter with which BETVICTOR is associated (such as CASINO, SLOTS, POKER and BETTING).

- Further, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registration of domain names which correspond to well known names or trade marks in which the Respondent has no apparent rights. Virtually all of these are in the online betting and gaming sector. The Domain Names are part of that pattern.
- Among the 1356 domains registered by the Respondent:
  - 8 include "bwin" (an abusive registration, mimicking bwin.com and infringing corresponding registered trade mark rights of Electraworks Limited);
  - 35 include "williamhill" (an abusive registration, mimicking williamhill.com and infringing corresponding registered trade mark rights of William Hill Organization Limited);
  - 35 include "888" (an abusive registration, mimicking 888.com and infringing corresponding registered trade mark rights of Cassava Enterprises (Gibraltar) Limited);
  - 18 include "paddypower" (an abusive registration, mimicking paddypower.com and infringing corresponding registered trade mark rights of Paddy Power Plc); and
  - 10 include "ladbrokes" (an abusive registration, mimicking ladbrokes.com and infringing corresponding registered trade mark rights of Ladbrokes International Limited).
- The Complainants state that although it is not clear whether the contact details registered by the Respondent are genuine or not, given the unusual circumstances of the Respondent registering 11 domain names targeting the Complainants on the same day, and the fact that the Respondent has elected to withhold postal contact details, it is not unreasonable to infer that the Respondent has provided false information. The Complainants invite the Respondent to provide independently verifiable evidence of her genuine identity.
- There is no legitimate reason for the Respondent's registration of the Domain Names.

### **The Respondent**

The Respondent replies to the contentions of the Complainants as follows:

- The Domain Names have not yet been used by the Respondent.
- The Domain Names were not registered abusively.
- The Respondent has owned the Domain Names for nearly ten months. During this time she has never approached the Complainants or any associated Group company (in without prejudice correspondence or otherwise) to sell, rent or transfer the Domain Names for payment.
- The betvictor.co.uk domain name was registered by the Complainants on 18 September 2002. The Respondent did not register the Domain Names until nearly ten years later. The Complainants cannot argue that they are being blocked from

registering domain names in which they are interested - if they were genuinely interested in registering any of the Domain Names, they would have registered them in the ten year period prior to the Domain Names being registered.

- As to the Complainants' contention that the Domain Names disrupt their business by directing traffic away from their websites, given that the Domain Names have not yet been used by the Respondent, the argument, it is said, fails to stand up to scrutiny.
- The Respondent states that Paragraph 3(b) of Nominet's Dispute Resolution Service Policy (the Policy) provides that failure to use a domain name for the purpose of email or a web site is not in itself evidence that the domain name is an Abusive Registration.
- The Domain Names do not feature in the results of search engine searches.
- The Respondent contends that the Complainants' claim of trade mark infringement is wholly unfounded given her understanding that a trade mark can only be infringed if a third party has made use of a sign in the course of trade. This is not the case here.
- As to the Complainants' suggestion that the Domain Names prevent the Complainants from policing their brand, such contention makes no sense at all to the Respondent.
- The Respondent maintains that the contention that she is using the Domain Names in a way which is likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that the Domain Names are registered to, operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the Complainants, is unfounded. The Domain Names have not yet been used by the Respondent and use has not been threatened. Moreover, the Complainants have not provided any evidence of actual confusion.
- As to the contention that the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of registering domain names incorporating well known marks in which she has no apparent rights, the Respondent points out that of the 1356 domain names the Complainants say have been registered by her, only 106 (i.e. 7 %) are in relation to known brands/registered trade marks. The remaining domain names are unrelated and generic and therefore the Complainants' arguments can be discounted. The Respondent gives two reasons for this. First, paragraph 4(a)(iv) of the Policy specifically states that a domain name will not be found to be part of a wider pattern or series of registrations if it is of a significantly different type or character to other domain names registered by the Respondent. Secondly, paragraph 4(d) of the Policy provides that holding a large portfolio of domain names is lawful.
- As to the Complainants' contention that the Respondent's contact details are false, the Respondent says that owners of domain names are not obliged to provide Nominet with their contact details and many registrants choose not to do so. The purpose of paragraph 3(a)(iv) is to catch registrants that have knowingly provided false information and, in any event, a complainant is obliged under this paragraph to obtain independent verification of falsity.
- The Respondent takes issue with the Complainants' contention that she is a serial cybersquatter, referring to the Nominet definition being *'The practice of registering a third party's intellectual property (or similarly spelt variants) as a*

*domain name with the sole intention of approaching them with an offer to sell it to them sometimes at an inflated price.* The Respondent has not registered the Domain Names with the sole intention of selling them at an inflated price, approached any third parties with the aim of selling domain names containing their intellectual property or had any Nominet decisions made against her.

- The Respondent contends that the Domain Names are not directing traffic away from the Complainants' sites, as they (the Domain Names) are not in use.

### **The Reply of the Complainants (to the Response of the Respondent)**

- The Complainants say that it is telling that the Respondent has not made reference to, nor provided evidence of any of the grounds listed at paragraph 4 of the Policy, it being this paragraph which lists factors which may demonstrate that a domain name is not an Abusive Registration. In particular, it is said that the Respondent has failed to demonstrate that she has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the Domain Names in connection with a genuine offering of goods or services, or that she has been commonly known by a name or legitimately connected with a mark which is identical or similar to the Domain Names, or that she has made legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Domain Names.
- Whilst the Respondent has denied the Complainants' allegations, she has asserted no positive explanation or justification whatsoever for her registration of the Domain Names.
- In relation to non-use (of the Domain Names) which the Respondent relies on, the Complainants contend that this in itself does not mean that a registration is not abusive. The Complainants rely on the case of *BT v One In A Million [1999] 1 WLR 903* in support of the contention that the mere registration of a domain name (without anything more, such as 'use') can amount to passing off.
- The Complainants do not consider that refraining to offer the Domain Names to the Complainants for sale or rent for 10 months, is sufficient to rebut the contention that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring them to the Complainants or a competitor. The Complainants note that the Respondent is silent on whether she has contacted the Complainants' competitors to offer the Domain Names for sale, rent or otherwise.
- As to the Respondent's allegation that the Complainants had the opportunity to obtain registration of the Domain Names for 10 years prior to her registration of them (and that therefore such registrations cannot be considered as blocking registrations for the purposes of the Policy), the Complainants note that the BETVICTOR brand was launched just 5 months prior to registration. The Complainants also say that it cannot be the case that a failure to register a domain name constitutes a lack of interest, let alone a waiver of rights. The logical extension of the Respondent's argument is that a complainant's failure to register a domain name could be run as a defence in every DRS complaint. The Complainants say that the fact that the Domain Names were registered so soon after the extensive BETVICTOR marketing campaign, serves to support the contention that it is more likely than not that the Domain Names constitute Abusive Registrations.

- The Respondent suggests that her large portfolio of domain name registrations not incorporating registered trade marks or well known brands of others, serves to mitigate against the 106 registrations in her name that do. The Complainants contend that this argument is flawed. The relevant 'pattern of registration' for the purposes of the Policy is the 106 registrations which incorporate the trade marks of the Complainants and its competitors in the online betting industry. The Complainants say that it is absurd to suggest that registering over 100 'cybersquatting' domain names can be acceptable, provided there is a large enough non-infringing portfolio as well.
- The Complainant's say that it is notable that the Respondent does not attempt to allege that she has rights in any of the third party trade marks used in her domain name registrations.
- The Respondent has referred to her activities as managing director of SGE. She is also managing director of the subsidiary, SGE Games Limited which operates a website at [www.sgegames.com](http://www.sgegames.com). This website compares discounts offered at online gaming, gambling and betting sites. It appears therefore that the Respondent is involved in a similar field of activity to the Complainants, making it inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainants' rights. Moreover, the Complainants' betvictor.com website is featured on the website at [www.sgegames.com](http://www.sgegames.com). The WayBackWhen Archive shows that as at 18 May 2012, (a month before the Respondent registered the Domain Names) a placeholder was operational at sgegames.com indicating that it would be 'coming soon'. Also, at [http://www.sgegames.com/About\\_SGE\\_Games](http://www.sgegames.com/About_SGE_Games), it is claimed that SGE Games is: '*committed to Responsible Gaming and only works with companies who align themselves to a responsible gaming environment*'. An in-depth knowledge of such companies would be required to make such a claim. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Complainants contend that this supports their assertion that the Respondent was aware of the Complainants on the date of registration of the Domain Names, further supporting a finding of Abusive Registration.

## 6. Discussions and Findings

Under the provisions of the Policy, for a Complaint to succeed, a Complainant is required to prove, on the balance of probabilities, that it has rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the domain name in issue and that the domain name in the hands of the Respondent is an Abusive Registration. Both elements are required.

### Complainant's 'Rights'

The meaning of 'Rights' is defined in the Policy as follows: '*Rights means rights enforceable by the Complainant, whether under English law or otherwise, and may include rights in descriptive terms which have acquired a secondary meaning*'.

The Lead Complainant owns a CTM trade mark registration for BETVICTOR, filed on 17 December 2010 and registered under number, 009608332. The domain names betvictor.com and betvictor.co.uk, registered in the name of the Second Complainant, resolve to [www.betvictor.com](http://www.betvictor.com), the Complainants' website. One or both of the Complainants also have unregistered rights in the BETVICTOR mark by virtue of its extensive use.

The Domain Names all encapsulate the BETVICTOR mark in its entirety. It is the first and dominant part of all of them and is followed only by descriptive or generic terms that an



Internet user might readily associate with the Complainants e.g 'bet, 'casino' and 'website'.

Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainants have Rights in a name or mark that is similar to the Domain Names.

The Panel must now therefore consider whether the Domain Names are Abusive Registrations in the hands of the Respondent.

### **Abusive Registration**

Paragraph 1 of the Policy defines Abusive Registration as a domain name which was either '*registered or otherwise acquired in a manner which, at the time when the registration or acquisition took place, took unfair advantage of or was unfairly detrimental to the Complainant's Rights*' or which '*has been used in a manner which has taken unfair advantage of or was unfairly detrimental to the Complainant's Rights*;'.

A useful guide as to what might constitute an Abusive Registration is contained in paragraph 3(a) of the Policy. It contains a non-exhaustive list of factors which may indicate that a domain name is an Abusive Registration. Such factors include circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or otherwise acquired the domain name primarily for the purposes of selling, renting or otherwise transferring it to the complainant (or a competitor) for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's out-of-pocket costs, as a blocking registration against a name or mark in which a complainant has rights, or for the purpose of unfairly disrupting the business of a complainant.

Other factors suggesting an Abusive Registration include a respondent using or threatening to use a domain name in a way which has confused or is likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that the domain name is registered to, operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the complainant.

A non-exhaustive list of countervailing factors is set out in paragraph 4 of the Policy. This paragraph contains a useful guide as to what does not constitute an Abusive Registration.

The Complainant maintains that most if not all the circumstances set out in Paragraph 3 of the Policy are present in this case. The Respondent, in answering the Complaint, challenges the assertions, or many of them, of the Complainant, but makes only brief reference to paragraph 4 of the Policy. The Complainants pass adverse comment on this. However, it is important to appreciate that paragraph 4 is an indicative list, not an exhaustive one, and if there are other relevant factors that a respondent wishes an Expert to take into account, he will do so.

Set out under various headings below are the Expert's views and findings on issues he regards as important for the purposes of a Decision in the context of this Complaint. It follows that not all matters in dispute, or in relation to which contentions have been advanced, are dealt with.

### **Non-use and the circumstances set out in Paragraph 4 of the Policy**

Given that the Respondent maintains that there has been no use of the Domain Names, it is unsurprising that she does not seek to align herself with the examples of *uses* in paragraph 4 that may be regarded as permissible, e.g. use in connection with a genuine offering of goods or services, or legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The circumstances set out in paragraph 3(a)(i) of the Policy – selling, blocking disrupting.

The Complainants contend that there are circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or otherwise acquired the Domain Names primarily for the purposes of selling, renting or otherwise transferring them to the Complainants (or a competitor), as a blocking registration against a name or mark in which they have rights, or for the purpose of unfairly disrupting their business.

Paragraph 3(a)(i) requires that the domain name in issue was acquired for the *primary* purpose of achieving one of these outcomes. However, there is no evidence that this is the case here. In fact, there is no evidence at all as to the primary purpose of the registrations. This is surprising, as one might have expected that in a case such as this, where a well-known mark is incorporated within, and is thereby similar to a domain name, and the respondent has participated in the proceedings, that some form of explanation would be forthcoming.

Confusion (paragraph 3(a)(ii) of the Policy)

A respondent using or threatening to use a domain name in a way which has confused or is likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that the domain name is registered to, operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the complainant, may be indicative of an Abusive Registration.

Confusion is alleged by the Complainants. The Respondent maintains that there can be no confusion because there is no use and that furthermore, there is no evidence of actual confusion. The question therefore arises as to whether there can be confusion for the purposes of paragraph 3(a)(ii) of the Policy in the absence of use.

As the Nominet DRS Expert Overview states, the English Courts have clearly held that mere registration of a domain name can constitute unfair use for the purposes of passing off and trade mark infringement, even if nothing more is done with the domain name. The approach under the Policy and indeed by this Expert is consistent with that view. Accordingly, even if the Domain Names are not being actively used but just held, that can be enough to support a finding of Abusive Registration based on use or threatened use (in a way which has confused or is likely to confuse people or businesses).

Here, the Domain Names resolve only to non-functioning websites. Whilst it may be clear, as soon as the Internet user is transported to these sites, that they have nothing at all to do with the Complainants' business (because they are non-functioning or otherwise), an allegation of confusing use can nevertheless be made out. As paragraph 3.3 of the Nominet DRS Expert Overview puts it:

*"..... the speculative visitor to the registrant's web site will be visiting it in the hope and expectation that the web site is a web site "operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the Complainant." This is what is known as 'initial interest confusion' and the overwhelming majority of Experts view it as a possible basis for a finding of Abusive Registration, the vice being that even if it is immediately apparent to the visitor to the web site that the site is not in any way connected with the Complainant, the visitor has been deceived".*

The Domain Names are inherently confusing. They all incorporate a well-known mark together with descriptive or generic terms that an Internet user might readily associate with the business of the mark's owners. And there are 11 of them. This is a case where it appears clear that the Respondent has sought to take unfair advantage of the

Complainants' rights (of which she was obviously aware), and where even a mere holding of the Domain Names is objectionable.

The Expert finds that the Respondent has used the Domain Names in a way which has confused or is likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that they are registered to, operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the Complainants.

*Pattern of registration – (paragraph 3(a)(iii) of the Policy)*

It is indicative of an Abusive Registration if a complainant can demonstrate that the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of registrations where he is the registrant of domain names which correspond to well known names or trade marks in which he has no apparent rights, and the domain name in issue is part of that pattern. The Respondent answers the allegation that the Domain Names are part of such a pattern by referring to the countervailing factor in paragraph 4. She argues that the Domain Names are not part of a wider pattern or series of registrations because they are of a significantly different type or character to the several other domain names registered by her which do not contain well-known marks or brands of others.

The Expert views the Respondent's argument as unpersuasive and accordingly finds that the Domain Names are part of a pattern of registrations corresponding to well known names or trade marks, specifically in the online betting and gaming sector (8 of the Respondent's other domain name registrations include "bwin", 35 include "williamhill", 35 include "888", 18 include "paddypower" and 10 include "ladbrokes").

*Conclusion*

As already noted, it is surprising that the Respondent has not explained her registration of the Domain Names. The Expert assumes that there is nothing more that she could say that would help refute the allegation of Abusive Registration.

Given the obvious scope for confusion, the pattern of registrations identified above and the absence of any explanation for registration of the Domain Names, the Expert has little difficulty in upholding the Complaint. Accordingly, the Expert finds that the Domain Names were registered in a manner which, at the time the registrations took place, took unfair advantage of or were unfairly detrimental to the Complainants' Rights or have been used in a manner which has taken unfair advantage of or was unfairly detrimental to the Complainants' Rights.

**7. Decision**

The Expert finds that the Complainants have rights in a name or mark that is similar to the Domain Names and is satisfied on the evidence before him that the Domain Names in the hands of the Respondent are Abusive Registrations. Accordingly, the Expert directs that the Domain Names:

betvictorbet.co.uk  
betvictorbetting.co.uk  
betvictorbingo.co.uk  
betvictorcasino.co.uk  
betvictorgames.co.uk  
betvictoronline.co.uk  
betvictorpoker.co.uk  
betvictorslots.co.uk  
betvictorsport.co.uk  
betvictorsports.co.uk

betvictorwebsite.co.uk

be transferred to the the Second Complainant, Victor Chandler International Limited.

**Signed: Jon Lang Dated: 5 July 2013**