

O/0652/26

TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

INTERIM DECISION

CONSOLIDATED PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF TRADE MARK REGISTRATIONS

UK00004037395



AND

UK00004037389



IN THE NAME OF ENTAIN OPERATIONS LIMITED

AND

RESPECTIVE OPPOSITIONS THERETO

UNDER NO. 450267 AND NO. 450269

BY MR M. RASHEV, SB ENTERTAINMENT LTD (MALTA)

Background and Pleadings

1. On 10 April 2024, Entain Operations Limited ('the Applicant') applied to register the trade marks shown on the cover of this decision in the UK, namely UK4037395 and UK4037389 ('the Contested Applications'). Both applications were published in the online Trade Marks Journal on 19 July 2024; and registration is sought for the same specification of goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.¹
2. On 18 October 2024, Mr M. Rashev, SB Entertainment Ltd (Malta) ('the Opponent') filed oppositions against the respective applications, pursuant to sections 3(1)(b) and 3(1)(c) of the Trade Marks Act 1994 ('the Act'). Both absolute grounds are directed to the Contested Applications in their entirety.
3. The Opponent's pleading is the same for each opposition action, i.e. that the Contested Applications are: descriptive by way of being purely indicative of characteristics of the goods/services at stake; and devoid of distinctive character.²
4. The Applicant filed Defences and Counterstatements for the respective oppositions in which it denies the claims against it in their entirety.
5. The two oppositions were consolidated on 17 January 2025,³ given the extent of their overlap.

A note on the progression of the consolidated cases in general

6. Put simply, the issue to be determined in this decision is whether the Opponent has complied with the requirement to provide an effective UK address for service. Before I consider this in detail, it is appropriate to note that the instant cases have had an eventful and protracted correspondence history in general. Not all of the correspondence is pertinent to the procedural issue at hand. I will, therefore,

¹ The full specification applied for in respect of each of the applications is set out at **Annex 1** to this decision.

² Statement of grounds, [5] (for both oppositions).

³ Under Rule 62(1)(g) of the Trade Marks Rules 2008.

chronicle the correspondence only to the extent that it relates to, or sheds light on, the UK address for service issue ('the AFS issue').

The timeline of recorded representatives for the Opponent

7. For reasons that will become apparent, I consider it appropriate to set out a chronology of the Opponent's changes in recorded representative in the following table:

Dates:	Opponent's recorded representative:	Notes:
18 October 2024 – 4 December 2025	Birkett Long LLP	The Form TM7 was filed on 18 October 2024. I note that the Opponent's written submissions of 1 October 2025 were filed by the Opponent itself rather than its recorded representative at that time.
4 December 2025 – 21 April 2026	Opponent represented itself	Knights PLC⁴ emailed the Registry on 4 December 2025, requesting its removal as recorded representative for the Opponent. On 15 January 2026, the Opponent filed a Form TM33P⁵ confirming that it would represent itself.
21 April 2026	Mayuk Chakravarti	A Form TM33P was filed confirming that Mr Chakravarti would represent the Opponent. His residential address was provided as the address for service.

⁴ I note that Knights PLC acquired Birkett Long LLP in June 2025.

⁵ Appointment or change of representative.

8. After the Opponent's UK representative was removed, the Registry wrote to the Opponent, which is a Maltese company with offices in Bulgaria and Malta, on 12 December 2025, to request it to provide a UK address for service by 12 January 2026. Various correspondence between the Registry and the parties culminated in a Case Management Conference ('CMC') being held, before myself, on 2 April 2026. The relevant details are set out in the post-CMC letter from the Registry, dated 17 April 2026, which can be found at **Annex 2** to this decision. The aforesaid letter was sent by both email and 'signed-for delivery' post.
9. On 17 April 2026, the Opponent requested a hearing to contest the Preliminary View that the opposition should be deemed withdrawn, stating that 'supporting evidence' would be provided during the hearing. A CMC was duly scheduled for 6 May 2026, subsequently re-scheduled for 11 May 2026.
10. On 21 April 2026, the Opponent filed a Form TM33P notifying the Registry that the Opponent was now represented by Mayuk Chakravarti. Due to an administrative oversight, the Registry did not have sight of this document until after the CMC of 11 May 2026. Separately, although on the same day, the Opponent himself emailed the Registry to confirm that, in addition to himself, Mayuk Chakravarti would attend the CMC. In his email, Mr Rashev refers to Mr Chakravarti as 'Shareholder and UK-based director of the opponent **SB Entertainment Ltd**' [my emphasis]. It is appropriate to note, however, that the recorded Opponent is not 'SB Entertainment Ltd', but Mr M. Rashev, SB Entertainment Ltd (Malta). However, it will be seen that, in the event, it does not really matter whether the Opponent is Mr Rashev himself or his company.
11. On 29 April 2026, the hard copy version of the Registry's post-CMC letter of 17 April 2026 was returned to the Registry with a date stamp of 24 April 2026 and marked 'Return to Sender: Doesn't live here'.

THE HEARING

12. A hearing took place before me, by telephone conference, on 11 May 2026. Both parties attended. The Opponent was ostensibly unrepresented; but accompanied by Mr Mayuk Chakravarti. As the Hearing Officer conducting the remote hearing, I was able to view on my 'control interface' the email names of everyone attending. I was able to note that the email name for Mr Chakravarti indicated 'Barchester Healthcare Homes Limited', and not the Loveday Belgravia Care Home.⁶ I was, at that time, unaware that Mr Chakravarti was present as the Opponent's representative because the recordal of the Form TM33P filed on 21 April 2026 would not be actioned until 2 June 2026. Mr Peter Dawson of Wiggin LLP appeared for the Applicant.

13. Mr Rashev's submission can be summarised as follows:

- That Mr Chakravarti is a shareholder of 'the company' and the 'local point of contact in the UK'; and that he had invited Mr Chakravarti to the hearing 'to explain what actually happened with this letter that was sent to his [...] office address'.
- In reply to my question of whether the Loveday Belgravia Care Home was the Opponent's address, Mr Rashev submitted that it was the address that serves as an office of Mr Chakravarti. He explained that he had delegated the task of handling the correspondence relating to the instant cases to Mr Chakravarti as a director and shareholder of 'this company'.
- Mr Rashev submitted that it was his understanding that the correspondence sent to the Loveday Belgravia Care Home was not handled properly. He explained that the failure to deal with the correspondence in question had prompted him to ask Mr Chakravarti to explain what had happened 'in defence of the address that was completely legitimate at the time'. He emphasised that, going forward, he had now provided Mr Chakravarti's home address to avoid further difficulties in receiving correspondence.

⁶ The Loveday Belgravia Home is the business to which the UK address details provided by the Opponent relates.

14. The fact pattern provided by Mr Rashev during the hearing had not been foreshadowed by a Witness Statement, or any other document, prior to the hearing. It was, therefore, new information for which the Applicant (as well as the Registrar) had not been prepared. Consequently, I indicated that I would be directing the Opponent to file a Witness Statement setting out the fact pattern introduced in the hearing by way of Mr Rashev's oral submissions.

15. Mr Dawson's submission can be summarised as follows:

- Irrespective of whether the facts introduced by way of Mr Rashev's oral submissions are to be formalised in a Witness Statement, it is not clear why Mr Chakravarty's unrelated business address would be a valid address for service for the Opponent (whether the Opponent is Mr Rashev himself or the company SB Entertainment Ltd).
- The deadline for the Opponent to provide a valid UK address for service had been missed repeatedly. The delay of almost 6 months is too great to be considered compliant with the Registry's request made in December 2025.

Post-hearing

16. On 11 May 2026, I wrote to the parties to confirm the direction that I had given during the hearing that took place earlier that day, according to which the Opponent was to file a Witness Statement setting out the new information that was introduced by Mr Rashev in his oral submissions, by the deadline of 19 May 2026.

17. On 15 May 2026, the Opponent filed two Witness Statements, from, respectively, Miroslav Rashev and Mayuk Chakravarti. Mr Rashev's Witness Statement is accompanied by two Appendices. I note that neither Witness Statement is dated;⁷ however, for reasons that will become apparent, this does not affect my decision.

⁷ A Witness Statement in which the statement of truth is undated is non-compliant and cannot be relied upon; CPR Part 22, Practice Direction 22 – Statements of Truth, at 2.7.

18. The content of Mr Rashev's Witness Statement can be summarised as follows:

- Mr Rashev states that he is 'director and major shareholder of SB Entertainment Limited, a Maltese company, which is the opponent in [the instant consolidated] cases';⁸
- He states that 'Mr Mayak Chakravarti is [sic] minor shareholder and serves as an investment director for the company in the United Kingdom'; and introduces (at Appendix 1) a 'shareholder excerpt from the Maltese Business Registry' in support.⁹ The aforesaid document shows that Mr Mayuk Chakravarti holds 82 out of the company's 1200 outstanding shares.¹⁰
- At paragraph [3], Mr Rashev states the following:

'In order to comply with Rule 12(1)(b),¹¹ I have delegated him the responsibility to provide an address for correspondence in the United Kingdom on behalf of the company he is involved in. Instead of his home address he suggested his work address because the facilities provide concierge that would handle any correspondence received for SB Entertainment Ltd.'
- Mr Rashev goes on to state that Mr Chakravarti works as the General Manager at the Loveday Care Home, citing the address details ('the Care Home Address') that were provided in the Opponent's Form TM33P¹² filed on 15 January 2026.¹³ A copy of the first four pages of a Contract of Employment, headed 'Loveday & Co', dated 31 December 2024, has been provided at Appendix 2. The document is incomplete because there are no

⁸ Witness Statement of M. Rashev, [1].

⁹ As above, [2]; Appendix 1.

¹⁰ Appendix 1.

¹¹ Trade Marks Rules 2008.

¹² Appointment or change of representative for opponent.

¹³ Witness Statement of M. Rashev, [3].

dated signatures to be seen anywhere on the document. Clause 5.1 states 'Your employment with the Employer commenced on 13th January 2025'.

- Mr Rashev proceeds to explain that, after he had informed Mr Chakravarti that the official letter of 20 April 2026 had been 'returned to sender', Mr Chakravarti 'ran an investigation'.¹⁴ He states that the letter was mishandled because it was addressed primarily to 'Mr M Rashev' and not primarily to 'SB Entertainment Ltd'.
- I reproduce the final paragraph of Mr Rashev's Witness Statement here:

'[7] On the following day (21st April) the opponent SB Entertainment Ltd has submitted a TM_33_P, [sic] [...] changing both the representative to Mr Chakravarti himself and the UK address of service to his home address. This address has an established link with SB Entertainment Ltd as it appears on official shareholder documents and elsewhere'.

19. On 10 June 2026, the Applicant filed comments in response to the Opponent's Witness Statements, which can be summarised as follows:

- The Applicant's essential argument is:
 - that the address provided by the Opponent on 13 January 2026 was not a valid and effective UK address for service at that time;
 - the Opponent's evidence and explanation post-dating the official letter of 17 April 2026, seek to recast the position after the fact;and
 - that Rule 12(1)(b) would cease to have any meaning if the Registrar were to grant that the UK address for service requirement has been satisfied in the instant consolidated oppositions.

¹⁴ Witness Statement of M. Rashev, [5].

- I note the following specific points:

(i) When the Form TM33P providing the Care Home Address was filed on 13 January 2026, the Opponent was on record as representing itself.¹⁵ The Care Home Address was not a valid address for either Mr Rashev or his company.¹⁶

(ii) The Care Home Address was not put forward as the work address of a connected or interested party in the instant opposition proceedings, but as the address for service of the recorded representative of the Opponent at that time, i.e. the Opponent itself.¹⁷

(iii) According to Mr Rashev's Witness Statement, Mr Chakravarti was delegated the responsibility of providing an address for correspondence.¹⁸ However, this detail was not provided when the Care Home Address was provided on 13 January 2026, nor was this mentioned until after the official letter, dated 17 April 2026, was sent following the CMC of 2 April 2026.¹⁹

iv) Even if it were accepted that Mr Chakravarti was the representative of the Opponent on 13 January 2026, authorised by the Opponent to receive the correspondence at the Care Home Address, nobody at the care home recognised the addressee of the correspondence.²⁰

(v) 'The requirement [to provide a valid UK address for service] exists to ensure that there is a genuine, effective point of contact in the United Kingdom at which documents can be reliably served. If a party can nominate an incorrect address, which is not the address for the claimed representative or company, and fail to correct it for over a quarter of a year, have official correspondence returned undelivered, and then retrospectively construct a

¹⁵ Applicant's observations dated 10 June 2026, [3], [6].

¹⁶ As above, [6].

¹⁷ Applicant's observations dated 10 June 2026, [8].

¹⁸ As above, [9].

¹⁹ Applicant's observations dated 10 June 2026, [9].

²⁰ As above, [14].

justification (and nominate the residential address of an associate) only after receiving indication of an adverse decision, then the rule ceases to have any meaning'.²¹

DECISION

20. This decision has been made after careful consideration of the parties' oral submissions, as well as all of the case papers available to me.

21. The Trade Marks Rules 2008 ('the Rules') 11 and 12 govern the provision of an address for service:

'Address for service'

11. - (1) For the purposes of any proceedings under the Act or these Rules, an address for service **shall** be filed by—

- (a) an applicant for the registration of a trade mark;
- (b) any person who opposes the registration of a trade mark in opposition proceedings;
- (c) any person who applies for revocation, a declaration of invalidity or rectification under the Act;
- (d) the proprietor of the registered trade mark who opposes such an application;
- (e) [...]

(2) The proprietor of a registered trade mark, or any person who has registered an interest in a registered trade mark, may file an address for service on Form TM33 or, in the case of an assignment of a registered trade mark, on Form TM16.

²¹ Applicant's observations dated 10 June 2026, [15].

(3) Where a person has provided an address for service under paragraph (1) or (2), that person may substitute a new address for service by notifying the registrar on Form TM33.

(4) An address for service filed under this Rule shall be an address in the United Kingdom, [Gibraltar] or the Channel Islands.

Failure to provide an address for service

12. - (1) Where—

- (a) a person has failed to file an address for service under rule 11(1); and
- (b) the registrar has sufficient information enabling the registrar to contact that person,

the registrar **shall** direct that person to file an address for service.

(2) Where a direction has been given under paragraph (1), the person directed shall, before the end of the period of one month [beginning immediately after] the date of the direction, file an address for service.

(3) Paragraph (4) applies where—

- (a) a direction was given under paragraph (1) and the period prescribed by paragraph (2) has expired; or
- (b) the registrar had insufficient information to give a direction under paragraph (1),

and the person has failed to provide an address for service.

(4) Where this paragraph applies—

- (a) in the case of an applicant for registration of a trade mark, the application shall be treated as withdrawn;

(b) in the case of a person opposing the registration of a trade mark, that person's opposition **shall** be treated as withdrawn;

(c) in the case of a person applying for revocation, a declaration of invalidity or rectification, that person's application shall be treated as withdrawn; and

(d) in the case of the proprietor opposing such an application, the proprietor shall be deemed to have withdrawn from the proceedings;

(e) [...]

(5) In this rule an "address for service" means an address which complies with the requirements of rule 11(4).'

[My emphasis added]

The Registrar's power

22. Rules 11 and 12 set out the Registrar's power to direct the Opponent to provide a valid UK address for service; and the consequences of non-compliance with the direction.²² The use of the word 'shall' in the aforesaid rules, (underlined and emboldened above at [21]) indicates that the provision of a valid UK address for service is mandatory if an Opposition is to proceed; and that, where this has not been provided, the Registrar *must* deem the opposition action to be withdrawn.

Considerations

23. The issue to be determined is whether the Preliminary View of the Registrar, given on 17 April 2026, according to which the Opponent was deemed to have failed to provide a valid UK address for service under Rule 12(1)(b), is to be upheld or reversed. In reaching my decision, I must consider whether the evidence and submissions provided by the Opponent succeed in demonstrating that the Care Home Address, provided by way of Form TM33P on 15 January 2026, was a valid UK address for service for the Opponent. If I find that the Opponent has not

²² It is, therefore, unnecessary to invoke the Registrar's broad case management powers under Rule 62(1) of The Rules.

complied with the requirements of Rule 12(1)(b), then the consolidated opposition claims must be deemed undefended.

24. Having reviewed the correspondence history of the consolidated proceedings, I can see that the Opponent has had the following opportunities to provide a valid UK address for service and/or demonstrate that it had complied with Rule 12(1)(b):

- Following the Registry's letter of 12 December 2025 to the Opponent requesting it to provide a valid UK address for service, the Care Home Address was provided by way of a late-filed Form TM33P on 15 January 2026.
- On 3 March 2026, when the Opponent filed a Form TM9R²³ to request a retrospective extension of time in which to provide a valid UK address for service (i.e. to enable its late-filed TM33P to be accepted as filed). The address provided was the Care Home Address.
- Mr Rashev emailed the Registry on 20 March 2026 to confirm that he would not be attending the CMC concerning the Applicant's objection to the Registry's Preliminary View to grant the requested extension of time. In his written submission in lieu of the hearing, he twice referred to the address that had been provided in the Form TM33P (i.e. the Care Home Address) as 'our new address'. The written submission made no mention of the arrangement for Mr Chakravarti to receive the Opponent's correspondence at the Care Home Address where he is said to have worked.
- On 17 April 2026, the Registry sent a post-CMC letter²⁴ with the Preliminary View that the Opponent had failed to provide a valid UK address for service and that the consolidated oppositions should, therefore, be withdrawn. On the same day, Mr Rashev emailed the Registry to object to the Preliminary View and request a hearing. He indicated that he would provide supporting evidence at the hearing.

²³ Request to extend a time period, set by examination or tribunals if you have missed the deadline.

²⁴ Reproduced at Annex 2 to this decision.

- On 21 April 2026, Mr Rashev emailed the Registry to confirm that Mayuk Chakravarti would be attending the hearing as 'shareholder and UK-based director of the opponent SB Entertainment Ltd'. A Form TM33P was also filed on this date naming Mr Chakravarti as the Opponent's representative and providing Mr Chakravarti's residential address in London, UK.²⁵
- At the CMC of 11 May 2026, attended by both Mr Rashev and Mr Chakravarti for the Opponent, Mr Rashev stated that:

Mr Chakravarti was now the Opponent's representative; that the Care Home Address 'served as his office'; and that he had been delegated to receive the Opponent's correspondence there, but that someone had not handled the letter properly.

- On 15 May 2026, the Opponent provided evidence in support its claim that Rule 12(1)(b) had been complied with, although I note that neither of the two Witness Statements is dated.

25. The above timeline shows that around four months had elapsed between the Opponent providing the Care Home Address as a valid UK address for service, and filing evidence intended to demonstrate compliance with Rule 12(1)(b). By reference to the table set out above at [7], the Opponent was on record as representing itself when it first provided the Care Home Address on 15 January 2026. The Opponent remained the recorded representative at the time it filed the Form TM9R on 3 March 2026 in which it, once again, provided the Care Home Address.

26. I agree with the Applicant's characterisation of the purpose of the requirement to provide a valid UK address for service as prescribed by Rule 12(1)(b); i.e. to ensure that there is a genuine, effective point of contact in the United Kingdom at which documents can be reliably served. This is reflected in the guidance on the IPO UK's website:

²⁵ Although, due to an administrative oversight, this was not processed until after the CMC.

'What is an address for service?'

An address for service is an address at which you can receive correspondence from the Intellectual Property Office (IPO) or third parties regarding your application or registered right. This address will also be used to send documents related to intellectual property proceedings.

It can be any address with which you or your business is associated. For example, it can be your home or business address. If you appoint a representative, their address will then be used as the address for service for all correspondence. Whilst it is possible to provide a virtual office or a PO Box address, it still must be a valid address where notices or letters can be delivered and read by the intended recipient.

An address for service must be an address in the UK, Gibraltar or the Channel Islands. We also accept the Isle of Man as a valid address for service.'

[My underlining added]

27. The Registrar, in dealing with any case, has a duty to observe the Overriding Objective which entails, inter alia, managing cases expeditiously, fairly and enforcing compliance with rules, practice directions and orders.²⁶

Conclusions

28. In my view, the Care Home Address, from the date it was provided up until the official letter of 17 April giving the Preliminary View, did not satisfy the requirements of Rule 12(1)(b). Even if Mr Chakravarti had been working at the Care Home at those times, he was not on record as representing the Opponent on those dates. Furthermore, even if Mr Chakravarti *had* been on record as representing the Opponent, it is plain that the Care Home Address was not functioning as an address for service. On the Opponent's own account, Mr Chakravarti did not

²⁶ Rule 1.1 of the Civil Procedure Rules ('The CPR').

become the Opponent's representative until 21 April 2026, three days after the official letter giving the Preliminary View that no valid UK address for service had been provided as required by Rule 12(1)(b). I agree with the Applicant that the belated appointment of Mr Chakravarti and provision of his UK residential address on 21 April 2026 cannot change the fact that, up until that date, the Opponent was without a valid UK address for service.

29. As correctly noted by the Applicant, the purpose of the requirement to provide a valid UK address for service is to ensure that there is a genuine and effective point of contact to enable official correspondence to be served so that legal proceedings may proceed smoothly within the UK jurisdiction. There have been four separate occasions on which official letters from the Registry have been sent to the Care Home Address and returned to the Registry marked by Royal Mail as 'Return to Sender. Doesn't live here'. The date stamps from Royal Mail on the aforesaid official letters are: 18 March 2026, 23 March 2026, 22 April 2026 and 24 April 2026. This demonstrates that the Care Home Address was not functioning as an effective address for service on those dates. On the 'March' dates, the Care Home Address was not a valid address for service for the Opponent's recorded representative (i.e. the Opponent itself) because it had no connection to the Opponent in the first place. On the 'April' dates, the letters were 'returned to sender', despite the Opponent, by this time, knowing that the Care Home Address was not in fact functioning as an address for service.

30. I agree with the Applicant's argument that the fact that the Opponent eventually appointed Mr Chakravarti as the Opponent's representative, providing his UK residential address for service, does not correct the repeated non-compliance with Rule 12(1)(b). To my mind, it cannot be the case that Rule 12(1)(b) allows a party to change its representative and supply their UK residential address after a 4-month period of repeated non-compliance. The timing of the later explanation and the subsequent appointment of Mr Chakravarti do not persuade me that the Care Home Address was, at the material time, a valid address for service for the Opponent.

31. The official letters of 12 December 2025 and 17 April 2026 make it explicitly clear that the consequence of failure to provide a valid UK address within the prescribed timeframe is that the opposition proceedings shall be treated as withdrawn.
32. The reasons why the Care Home Address was provided in the first place remain opaque. It seems to me that the timing of the Opponent's explanation and eventual appointment of Mr Chakravarti as a representative suggest an attempt to re-cast the state of affairs at the time when the Care Home Address was first provided to the Registry.
33. I have carefully considered all of the papers available to me, and the oral submissions of both parties.
34. It remains the case that the Care Home Address was never a valid address for service for the Opponent. Even accepting that Mr Chakravarti was working at the Care home, and I am unable to determine whether/for how long he was, he was never on record as the Opponent's representative when the Care Home Address was being held out as the Opponent's address for service. Perhaps most significantly, even if Mr Chakravarti had been the recorded representative for the Opponent when the Care Home Address was being held out as the valid address for service, correspondence could not be reliably delivered there because it was repeatedly returned to the Registry. It is my view that a finding that Rule 12(1)(b) has been complied with in the circumstances of these proceedings would be contrary to the purpose of the requirements; and it would run counter to the spirit of the Overriding Objective.
35. In reaching my decision, I have borne in mind that the Contested Applications will proceed to registration and that the Opponent will have lost its opportunity to have its section 3(1) objections to the aforesaid applications heard. However, compliance with the UK address for service requirements is a fundamental procedural requirement for parties seeking to participate in proceedings before the Tribunal. It may remain open to the Opponent to institute invalidation proceedings based on section 3(1) of the Act against the Applicant's marks in future; subject, of course, to the Opponent's ability to provide a valid UK address for service.

36. In the light of the foregoing, the Preliminary View of the Registry, dated 17 April 2026, is confirmed and the Opponent's consolidated claims are deemed withdrawn.

Costs

37. The Applicant has been successful and is entitled to a contribution towards its costs. Neither party made submissions on the matter of costs during the CMC. The Applicant has indicated in its written comments of 9 June 2026 that it reserved the right to request an off-scale costs award.²⁷ I, therefore, allow 14 days from the date of this interim decision for the parties to file submissions on costs. Upon either receipt or absence of such submissions by **Friday 7th August 2026** I will issue a supplementary decision confirming any costs award, at which point the appeal period will be set.

Dated this 24th day of July 2026

N. R. Morris

**For the Registrar,
the Comptroller-General**

²⁷ Applicant's written comments of 9 June 2026, [18].

Annex 1

For each of the Contested Applications, registration is sought for the following:

Class 9:

Computer software; application software for mobile phones, tablets and handheld computers; computer software for gaming, gambling and betting; software for games with monetary prize payouts; software for gaming, casino, gambling and betting platforms; computer and video games; databases (electronic); computer hardware for games and gaming; electronic betting terminals; downloadable electronic publications and reports; downloadable electronic betting slips, lottery tickets, and raffle tickets; downloadable podcasts and webcasts; audio-visual recordings; electronic bulletin boards; electronic loyalty scheme cards; virtual and augmented reality software; virtual and augmented reality hardware; downloadable computer software for use as a wallet for blockchain tokens; downloadable computer software for managing, displaying, monetizing, buying, selling, trading, transferring, clearing, confirming, and authenticating virtual goods, blockchain tokens, digital tokens, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), digital media, digital files, and digital assets; downloadable virtual goods, namely, digital files, digital collectibles created using blockchain-based software technology and smart contracts, or authenticated by non-fungible tokens, featuring virtual art work, digital collectibles, audio works, visual works, audio visual works, graphic representations, photos, or images; downloadable virtual goods, namely, digital collectible emblems, trophies, badges, coins, certificates, cards, character clothing and skins, wallpapers, artwork, and in-game currency for use in online virtual worlds and environments created for entertainment purposes; interfaces for metaverse; downloadable image files, featuring avatars on the metaverse; parts and fittings for all the aforesaid goods.

Class 35:

Data management and processing; compilation of information into computer databases; compilation of computer databases; loyalty, incentive and bonus program services; statistical analysis and reporting; compilation of sporting and other statistics including odds; market analysis and research; opinion polling; advertising, marketing, and promotional services; business administration; information, advisory and consultancy services relating to the aforesaid.

Class 38:

Transmission of information over a global computer network such as the internet including information, messages, text, sound, images and data pertaining to sporting events, gambling, gaming and betting including statistics, odds, results, commentaries and reports; providing access to gaming, gambling and betting websites and platforms on the internet; providing access to multiple user network systems allowing access to gaming, gambling, and betting information and services over the Internet and other global networks; telecommunications providing access to websites on the internet to play games; broadcasting; webcasting; subscription television broadcasting services; interactive broadcasting and communications services; providing internet chat room services; provision of on-line forums; information, advisory and consultancy services relating to the aforesaid.

Class 41:

Entertainment services; gaming, gambling, betting and casino services; provision of gaming, betting, gambling and casino services through physical and electronic sites; organisation of games; bookmaker services; conducting lotteries and prize draws; organisation and conducting competitions; provision of interactive games, interactive entertainment and/or interactive competitions; organisation and presentation of gaming, gambling, betting or casino events; operating and providing online gaming, gambling, betting and casino platforms; provision of casino facilities; amusements; provision of a website allowing a user to bet, gamble and play games; providing a website featuring casino, betting, gaming and gambling information; provision of downloadable audio, visual and audio visual recordings; electronic publishing; provision of online non-downloadable publications; sporting and cultural activities; sports entertainment services; sports information and news services; information, advisory and consultancy services relating to the aforesaid.

Class 42:

Computer services relating to gaming, gambling, betting and casinos; providing online, non-downloadable software; providing online, non-downloadable gaming, gambling, betting and casino software provision of technical support in the fields of interactive entertainment, gaming, gambling, betting and casinos; design and development of computer hardware and software; programming of gaming, gambling, betting and casino software; design and development of computer game

software creating, maintaining and hosting websites; software as a service [saas]; software as a service in the fields of gaming, gambling and betting; platform as a service [paas]; platform as a service in the fields of gaming, gambling and betting; [providing temporary use of non-downloadable software that gives users the ability to upload, modify and share virtual reality content, augmented reality content, mixed reality content, information, experiences and data; design and development of virtual reality and augmented reality and mixed reality hardware and software; providing online sites that gives users the ability to upload, modify and share virtual reality, mixed reality and augmented reality content, information, experiences and data; web-based services related to blockchain-based non-fungible tokens (nfts), including for creating, providing information about, authentication, grading, valuation, selling, auctioning and trading nfts; information, advisory and consultation services relating to the aforesaid.

Annex 2



Intellectual
Property
Office

Concept House
Cardiff Road, Newport
NP10 8QC

T +44 (0) 30 0300 2000

Mr Miroslav Rashev, SB
Entertainment Ltd (Malta)
48-46 Edbury Bridge Road
London
SW1W 8QF

Your Reference: O13959GB
Our Reference: OP000450267
Examiner: Huw Knight
Direct Telephone: +44(0)1633433044
Date: 17 April 2026

Party A: Mr. M. Rashev, SB
Entertainment Ltd (Malta)

Party B: Entain Operations Limited

Consolidated Opposition Nos: OP000450267 & OP000450269

If you need to reply, please email tribunalsection@ipo.gov.uk quoting our reference provided at the top of this letter. All correspondence must be copied to the other party.

Dear Recipient,

The following letter applies to both opposition cases, OP000450267 & OP000450269.

Post-CMC letter for cons. OP450267 & 450269 SPORTINGBET

1. I write following the Case Management Conference ('CMC') of 2 April 2026, and further to the Registry's letter of 12 December 2025.

2. The CMC

The purpose of the CMC was to re-consider the Preliminary View of the Registrar, dated 16 March 2026, to accept the Opponent's late-filed request for an extension of time in which to provide a valid UK address for service.

3. Only the Applicant attended the CMC, represented by Mr Peter Dawson of Wiggin LLP. The Opponent, who is self-represented, had elected not to attend.

4. Mr Dawson's oral submissions can be summarised as follows:

(i) The Applicant was willing for the Opponent's extension of time request to be granted. However, the real issue at stake was the question of the validity of the address for service provided by the Opponent.

(ii) Mr Dawson submitted that the following address provided by the Opponent appeared to relate to a care home by the name of Loveday Belgravia:

'48-56 Ebury Bridge Road
London
United Kingdom
SW1W 8QF'.

(iii) Mr Dawson argued that this did not appear to be a valid UK address for service and that the Opposition proceedings should, therefore, be struck out.

5. The Registry's official letter of 12 December 2025 contained the following paragraphs:

'As this opposition has been filed after 31 December 2020 you must comply with the new address for service rules. Please see paragraph 8 of Tribunal Practice Notice (2/2020) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/tribunal-practicenotice-2020-end-of-transition-period-impact-on-tribunal-proceedings>

You are directed under Rule 12(1)(b) to provide an address for correspondence in the United Kingdom (which for the purpose of the Act includes the Isle of Man, the Channel Islands and Gibraltar).

In accordance with Rule 12(2) this address for service must be filed within one month from the date of this letter, that is on or before 12 January 2026.

If one is not provided within this time, in accordance with Rule 12(4)(b) the opposition shall be treated as withdrawn.'

6. On 17 February 2026, the Registry wrote to the parties, by email and by signed-for post, in the following terms:

'I refer to the Tribunal's official letter dated 12 December 2025 directing the opponent to file a UK address for service on a Form TM33P on or before 12 January 2026.

It is noted that the opponent filed a Form TM33P on 13 January 2026, nominating a UK address for service. Upon review, the form was filed outside of the statutory period set in the Rules and therefore, the opponent is required to file a retrospective extension of time on a Form TM9R and the accompanying £125.00 fee in order to cover the time period from 12 January 2026 until 13 January 2026.

A copy of this form can be found at: Request to extend a time period, set by examination or tribunals, if you have missed the deadline - GOV.UK.

A Form TM9R and £125.00 must be received within 14 days of the date of this letter that is on or before 03 March 2026. Please ensure a copy of the form is also sent to the applicant.

Failure to file the Form TM9R by the above deadline may result in the Tribunal issuing a decision on the failure to comply with these Rules.'

7. It is noted that the hard copy letter sent by 'signed-for delivery' post to the UK address provided by the Opponent was returned to the Registry on 18 March 2026 marked as 'Return to Sender: Doesn't live here'.

8. Upon investigation by the Registry, and as submitted by the Applicant, the UK address provided by the Opponent appears to be that of the Loveday Belgravia care home.
9. It is, therefore, the Preliminary View of the Registry that the Opponent has failed to provide a valid UK address for service in accordance with Rule 12(1)(b) and that, as a consequence, the opposition is to be deemed withdrawn.
10. If either party disagrees with the preliminary view they should request a hearing within 14 days from the date of this letter, that is on or before **01 May 2026**.
11. If no response is received within the time allowed, the Preliminary View will be automatically confirmed, and **the opposition for both OP000450267 and OP000450269 will be withdrawn**.

Yours faithfully,

N. Rhea Morris
Hearing Officer