

DECISION OF THE THIRD-PARTY DECIDER

CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A / SIGHTWISE GLOBAL LIMITED

Case no. 444284 / circusslots.be

1. The Parties

1.1. Complainant: **CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A.**
Enterprise number 0451.000.609
Rue des Guillemins 129
4000 Liège
Belgium

Represented by :

COGITUS SRL – Mr Philippe PARTOUNE
Legal advisor – Trademark Attorney
Avenue des Bouleaux 30
4053 Embourg
Belgium

Hereafter referred to as “the Complainant”

1.2. Domain name holder: **SIGHTWISE GLOBAL LIMITED**
Triq Il-Modd 17
SWQ 2373 Swieqi
Malta

Hereafter referred to as the “Domain Name Holder”

2. Domain name

The disputed domain name is : **circusslots.be**. It was registered on 4 June 2026 at 15:02 CEST.

It is referred to as the “Domain Name”.

3. Procedure

3.1. The Complaint is dated 2 September 2026.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the Domain Name.

The Complainant gave the Domain Name Holder seven calendar days to implement the requested transfer voluntarily.

3.2. On 4 September 2026 , CEPANI sent the Complaint by e-mail to the address recorded in the WHOIS database, with a copy by ordinary mail, in accordance with Articles 4 and 5 of the Rules.

The proceedings commenced on that date.

The Domain Name Holder did not transfer the Domain Name within the seven-day period provided by Article 3.2.8 of the Rules and did not submit a Response within the 21-day period provided by Article 6.1. of the Rules.

3.3. On 29 September 2026, Jean-Christophe LARDINOIS was appointed as Third-Party Decider in accordance with Article 7.1 of the CEPANI Rules for domain name dispute resolution, in force since 1 January 2022 (the “Rules”), after providing the statement of availability, acceptance and independence required by Article 8.

DNS Belgium had placed the Domain Name on hold.

3.4. The debates were deemed closed on 6 October 2026 under Article 13 of the Rules.

Under Article 6.4 of the Rules, the absence of a Response does not stop the proceedings. The dispute is decided based on the Complaint and the evidence submitted.

Under Article 11.4, the Third-Party Decider determines the admissibility, relevance and weight of that evidence.

Articles 15 and 16 empower the Third-Party Decider to decide the dispute. The Complaint must be determined in accordance with the dispute resolution policy set out in Article 10 of the Terms and Conditions for .be domain name registrations of DNS Belgium (respectively, the “Policy” and the “Terms and Conditions”), the registration agreement and the Rules.

The registration data identify English as the language of the Domain Name Holder.

Under Article 12.1 of the Rules, this decision is therefore rendered in English.

4. Factual Background

4.1. The Complainant and its rights

CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A., is a Belgian public limited company with its registered office at Rue des Guillemins 129, 4000 Liège, Belgium.

The extract from the Belgian Crossroads Bank for Enterprises produced as Annex 02 shows that the company is active and carries on, among other activities, gambling and betting activities.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademarks consisting of or incorporating CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO.

Annex 03 identifies, among others, European Union trademark CIRCUS, registration no. 015030927, filed on 22 January 2016 and registered on 16 December 2016 in classes 9, 28 and 41, and European Union trademark CIRCUS CASINO, registration no. 006071914, filed on 5 July 2007 and registered on 23 October 2008 in classes 9, 37 and 41 and Benelux trademark circus.be, registration no. 1409859, registered on 25 April 2020.

Annex 04 identifies CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A. as owner of the marks relied on and records their status and expiry dates.

It includes European Union word mark CIRCUS, registration no. 018670434, filed on 12 March 2022, registered on 7 November 2022 and expiring on 12 March 2032, in classes 9, 28, 41, 42 and 43.

Its specification expressly covers “slot machines operated, whether or not online” and casino, gaming and gambling services, including online game services. Annex 04 also records Benelux word mark circus.be no. 1409859, expiring on 21 January 2030.

The Complainant also uses the CIRCUS sign for online gaming activities in Belgium. Annex 05 shows the website circus-dice.be displaying CIRCUS branding and offering casino, dice and “Dice slots” categories.

The general terms in Annex 06 identify CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A. and SLOTS SRL as operators of that website and refer to Belgian Gaming Commission licences.

4.2. The Domain Name Holder and the disputed website

According to the DNS Belgium data in Annex 01, circusslots.be was registered on 4 June 2026 at 15:02 CEST by Sightwise Global Limited, Triq Il-Modd 17, SWQ 2373 Swieqi, Malta. The registrant language is English.

The Domain Name Holder’s own corporate website, reproduced in Annex 07, describes its business as the acquisition, management and monetisation of digital properties.

Its advertised services include “Domain Management Services”, “Supplier Relationship Management” and “Domain Marketing and Affiliate Traffic”.

Annexes 08 and 09 show that the disputed website is presented under the designation “Circus Casino Belgique”.

It refers to a Belgian online casino, casino games, slot machines and promotional offers and contains calls to action such as “JOUER MAINTENANT” and “OBTENEZ LE BONUS”. Its pages also display a “Circus Casino Review” logo and a disclaimer stating that the site provides independent casino reviews and information and is not affiliated with “Circus Casino Belgique” or its operators. That disclaimer is contradicted by the rest of the website.

The site repeatedly speaks in the first person as if it were the casino operator. It states, for example, that “*Circus Casino Belgique*” holds an official licence from the Belgian Gaming Commission, that “notre plateforme” is licensed, and that its reputation is based on years of experience in the Belgian gaming sector (Annexes 08 and 09).

It also refers to land-based “circus casino” establishments and invites users to visit “*le site officiel circus casino be*” (Annex 08).

The website contains sections referring to other casinos, including Spinwinera and Amonbet, with calls to action. It does not state any Belgian licence number, while its footer displays a generic “Gambling Commission” logo.

4.3. Redirections to third-party gambling websites

The Complaint, section 5.2.12, reproduces a capture dated 2 September 2026 showing that a call to action initiated an HTTP 302 redirection from circusslots.be/go... to a third-party gambling website.

Annexes 10 to 14 document several third-party gambling destinations reached in that context. Some of those sites displayed a message stating that access from Belgium was blocked or unavailable.

Annex 14 documents another destination, spinalto1.com. Its address includes a “stag=80669_...” parameter, and the page contains a sign-up form offering a welcome bonus.

4.4. Belgian gaming licences and the disputed website’s terms

Annexes 15 and 16 contain official Belgian Gaming Commission data concerning A+ and B+ licences.

They identify CIRCUS-branded licensed websites and establishments linked to the Complainant or, according to the Complaint, to a company within its group.

Annex 16 expressly identifies dice.circus.be and circus-dice.be in connection with CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A. and also shows “Circus Casino” and “Circus Casino Bonnelles” as names of establishments operated by the Complainant. Annex 16 contains only the first page of the B+ list.

Annex 17 reproduces the page headed “CONDITIONS GÉNÉRALES D'UTILISATION DE CIRCUS CASINO BELGIQUE” available at circusslots.be/terms-and-conditions.

Although section 5.2.20 of the Complaint describes Annex 17 as the Complainant's own terms, the address visible on the screenshot shows that it is a page of the disputed website.

Those terms purport to regulate player registration, identity verification, deposits and withdrawals, gaming rules, account security and responsible gambling.

On the evidence submitted, and in the absence of any Response, the Third-Party Decider considers these facts established. Their legal significance is examined below.

5. Position of the parties

5.1. Position of the Complainant

The Complainant requests the transfer of the Domain Name and submits that the three cumulative requirements of Article 10 (b) (1) of the Policy are satisfied.

First, it argues that circusslots.be is confusingly similar to its CIRCUS trademarks because it reproduces CIRCUS in full and adds only the descriptive term “slots”, which refers directly to the gaming products and services covered by those marks.

Second, it submits that the Domain Name Holder has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

It has never authorised the use of CIRCUS marks, has no relationship with the Domain Name Holder, and says that Sightwise Global Limited is not commonly known as “Circus”, “Circus Slots” or “Circus Casino Belgique”.

It further argues that the website is not a bona fide review or information site, but a commercial gateway redirecting users to third-party gambling websites.

Third, it submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, in particular to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's rights and activities.

5.2. Position of the Domain Name Holder

The Domain Name Holder did not file a response or any observations.

6. Discussion and Findings

Article 10 (b) (1) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove three cumulative elements : (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark, trade name, registered name, company name or other right listed in the Policy in which the Complainant has rights; (ii) the Domain Name Holder has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) the Domain Name was registered or is being used in bad faith.

6.1. Identity or confusing similarity

6.1.1. The Complainant's rights

The Complainant has established that it owns registered CIRCUS word marks.

In particular, the Complainant owns European Union word mark CIRCUS no. 018670434, registered on 7 November 2022 and in force until 12 March 2032.

Its specification expressly covers slot machines, including online slot machines, and casino and online gaming services (Annex 04).

The Complainant also owns Benelux word mark circus.be no. 1409859 (Annexes 03 and 04).

The other CIRCUS-formative marks listed in Annex 03 need not be examined.

There is no issue as to standing: the evidence identifies CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A. itself as proprietor of the rights relied on.

This distinguishes the present case from circus-belgium.be (Case no. 444260), where the complainant relied on rights as a licensee, and circus-be.be (Case no. 444269), where standing depended on a licence and an express authorisation from CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A.

6.1.2. Comparison of the signs

The relevant verbal element of the Domain Name is “circusslots”.

It reproduces CIRCUS in full , without alteration , at the beginning of the Domain Name.

The additional word “slots” is descriptive of a category of casino games and does not distinguish the Domain Name from the CIRCUS mark.

On the contrary, it strengthens the association with the Complainant’s activities : the CIRCUS word mark expressly covers slot machines and the Complainant itself uses the expression “Dice slots” as a game category on its website circus-dice.be (Annex 05).

Internet users are therefore likely to understand circusslots.be as referring to a slot-machine offering associated with the CIRCUS brand.

The fact that “circus” is also an ordinary word does not change this conclusion.

For gaming and casino goods and services, the term is not descriptive ¹.

Nothing in the record suggests that the Domain Name is used for circus-themed content; the website instead presents itself as “Circus Casino Belgique”.

This conclusion is consistent with recent CEPANI decisions.

In circus-belgium.be (Case no. 444260) and circus-be.be (Case no. 444269), additions to the element CIRCUS did not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

In goldenpalace-casino.be (Case no. 444268), the descriptive addition “casino” likewise did not distinguish the domain name from the earlier mark.

The “.be” suffix is a technical registration requirement and is disregarded for this comparison.

¹ See, to that effect, *circus-be.be*, Case no. 444269.

The website's targeting of Belgian users is relevant instead to the assessment of bad faith.

The Domain Name is therefore confusingly similar to the CIRCUS trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

The first requirement of Article 10 (b) (1) is satisfied.

6.2. Rights or legitimate interests

6.2.1. Applicable standard

Article 10 (b) (3) of the Policy lists non-exhaustive circumstances that may establish rights or legitimate interests.

These include use, before notice of the dispute, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; being commonly known by the domain name; and legitimate non-commercial or fair use without an intention misleadingly to divert consumers for commercial gain.

Because proving a negative fact is inherently difficult, CEPANI decisions accept that a complainant may first establish a credible prima facie case of absence of rights or legitimate interests.

The burden then shifts to the Domain Name Holder to produce evidence to the contrary.

Recent CEPANI decisions concerning online gaming have applied that approach, including goldenpalace-casino.be (Case n° 444268) and circus-be.be (Case n° 444269).

The Complainant has established such a prima facie case here.

6.2.2. No authorization and no name recognition

There is no evidence that the Complainant authorised the Domain Name Holder to use the CIRCUS marks or the designation "Circus Casino Belgique".

There is also no evidence that Sightwise Global Limited has ever been commonly known as “Circus”, “Circus Slots” or “Circus Casino Belgique”.

Its own corporate website instead describes a business focused on managing and monetising digital properties and affiliate traffic (Annex 07).

6.2.3. No bona fide offering of goods or services

The use shown in the record cannot reasonably be characterised as a bona fide independent information or review service.

The website presents itself as “Circus Casino Belgique”, contains calls to action relating to casino play and registration, and publishes terms drafted as if it operated player accounts and gambling services.

The “Circus Casino Review” logo and disclaimers do not alter that assessment.

The overall presentation contradicts them.

The website speaks in the first person as the operator itself, states that “*notre plateforme*” is licensed by the Belgian Gaming Commission, claims copyright in the name “Circus Casino Belgique” while simultaneously disclaiming affiliation with that same entity, and publishes terms and conditions characteristic of a gambling operator (Annex 17).

The Domain Name itself contains no wording indicating criticism, comparison or independent review.

The site repeatedly adopts the “Circus Casino Belgique” identity and directs users to third-party gambling websites rather than offering a genuinely independent comparative service.

A website that presents itself as the trademark owner’s own casino is not a review site merely because it labels itself as one.

6.2.4. Claim of a Belgian licence

The disputed website also claims that its operator holds an official Belgian Gaming Commission licence, but it identifies no licence number and displays a generic “Gambling Commission” logo rather than the logo of the Belgian authority.

The Complainant states that it has consulted the complete A+, B+ and F1+ registers of the Belgian Gaming Commission (Complaint, section 5.2.3).

The extracts produced as Annexes 15 and 16 do not identify the Domain Name Holder or circusslots.be.

Annex 16 is, however, only the first page of the B+ list.

The Domain Name Holder did not file a Response and has not produced any evidence of a licence.

The record instead identifies CIRCUS-branded licensed websites operated by the Complainant (Annexes 06 and 16) or presented by it as operated by a group company (Annex 15).

It is unnecessary in these proceedings to determine whether the Domain Name Holder or any destination website incurs criminal or regulatory liability.

The evidence is sufficient to conclude that the Domain Name Holder’s use is neither a bona fide offering nor legitimate non-commercial or fair use within Article 10 (b) (3).

No evidence has been produced to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case.

The second requirement of Article 10(b)(1) of the Policy is satisfied.

6.3. Registration or use in bad faith

6.3.1. Applicable standard

Article 10 (b) (1) (iii) requires proof that the Domain Name was registered or is being used in bad faith.

These are alternatives , not cumulative requirements.

Article 10 (b) (2) expressly identifies bad faith where a domain name is intentionally used to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location by creating confusion with the complainant's trademark or other protected designation as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

Bad faith is not established merely because the Domain Name Holder did not respond.

It may, however, be inferred from the objective circumstances that show with reasonable certainty that the Domain Name Holder knew of the Complainant's prior rights and deliberately sought to exploit them.

CEPANI applied that approach in *circus-belgium.be* and *circus-be.be*.²

6.3.2. Knowledge of the Complainant's rights

The circumstances establish that the Domain Name Holder knew of the Complainant and its CIRCUS activities.

The Domain Name was registered on 4 June 2026, after the Complainant had obtained the CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO trademark registrations relied on in these proceedings.

More importantly, the website itself shows that knowledge.

It operates under the designation "Circus Casino Belgique", refers to Belgian casino activities and Belgian regulatory authorisation, and presents "Circus Casino Belgique" as the operator of player accounts and gambling services.

It also refers to land-based "Circus Casino" establishments and invites users to visit what it calls the "site officiel circus casino be" (Annex 08).

Its terms and conditions likewise present "Circus Casino Belgique" as the operator of gambling services (Annex 17).

² Case no. 444260 and Case no. 444269).

“Circus Casino” is also the name used by the Complainant for gaming establishments (Annex 16).

The choice of CIRCUS therefore cannot plausibly be regarded as coincidental.

6.3.3. Commercial purpose and diversion of traffic

The evidence also establishes a commercial purpose.

The Domain Name Holder describes its business as including “Domain Marketing and Affiliate Traffic” (Annex 07), while the disputed website contains calls to action that redirect users to third-party gambling websites.

The fact that several destinations refused access from Belgium (Annexes 10 to 13) does not alter the analysis.

Article 10 (b) (2) of the Policy concerns the intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain, not whether gain was ultimately achieved.

Annex 14 shows a destination URL containing a “stag=...” parameter consistent with affiliate tracking.

Whatever the precise contractual or remuneration arrangements with third parties, the evidence as a whole shows that the Domain Name is used to divert traffic attracted by the CIRCUS sign towards third-party gambling destinations.

6.3.4. Confusion as to source or affiliation

Using a domain name that incorporates the Complainant’s trademark to draw users to third-party commercial offerings, through a website presented in a manner likely to suggest an official or affiliated relationship, is the type of conduct expressly contemplated by Article 10 (b) (2) of the Policy.

The unsupported claim that the website operator holds a Belgian Gaming Commission licence reinforces that impression by suggesting that the website forms part of an authorised Belgian CIRCUS gaming operation.

The Third-Party Decider therefore finds that the Domain Name was registered with knowledge of the Complainant's rights and is, in any event, being intentionally used to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion as to source, affiliation, sponsorship or endorsement.

Considering these findings, it is unnecessary to examine the Complainant's further arguments concerning the alleged obfuscation of the website's code, the parallel complaint concerning circusedice.be, or the possible application of the Belgian Act of 7 May 1999 on games of chance.

The third requirement of Article 10 (b) (1) of the Policy is satisfied.

7. Decision

For these reasons, the Third-Party Decider finds that the three cumulative conditions of Article 10 (b) (1) of the Policy are satisfied.

Pursuant to Article 10 (e) of the Terms and Conditions, the registration of the domain name

circusslots.be

is transferred to CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A.

Brussels, 20 October 2026

Jean-Christophe LARDINOIS
Third-Party Decider