

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Monster Energy Company v. Xavier Satorra
Case No. D2025-2625

1. The Parties

Complainant is Monster Energy Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Xavier Satorra, Spain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <monsterenergy.blog> is registered with Automattic Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2025. On July 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Knock Knock WHOIS Not There, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 8, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 10, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2025. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Procedural Issue: Language of the Proceedings

Paragraph 11(a) of the Rules provides that the language of the proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement unless otherwise specified in that agreement or agreed by the parties. The paragraph also provides that the Panel has the authority to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.

Notwithstanding the Registration Agreement being in Spanish, Complainant requested that English be adopted as the language of the present proceeding. The Panel considers the following assertions of Complainant:

- the disputed domain name is composed of English words suggesting that Respondent has the ability to communicate in English;
- Complainant and their representatives do not speak, read, or understand Spanish and are based in the United States. Continuing the proceedings in Spanish would entail additional expenses and delays and could increase the risk of mistranslation or misunderstanding of critical statements and communications;
- an Internet search of Complainant's trademarks would reveal numerous references to the MONSTER brand in English specifically.

The Panel notes that on July 11 and 14, 2025, Respondent sent email communications to the Center in English. Therefore, the Panel finds that Respondent is able to understand and communicate in English.

Furthermore, Respondent has been given an opportunity to object to the language of the proceedings being English through the submission of pleadings to the Complaint but has chosen not to respond.

The Panel accepts Complainant's request and determines that the language of this proceeding will be English (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), sections 4.5.1 and 4.5.2, *Laverana GmbH & Co. KG v. Silkewang, Jiangsu Yun Lin Culture Communication Co., Ltd. / xia men yi ming wang luo you xian gong si*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0721](#), *eBay Inc. v. NicSoft, Antonio Francesco Tedesco*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0812](#)).

5. Factual Background

Complainant is in the beverages business since at least 2002 and is the owner of MONSTER ENERGY trademark registrations. In addition to beverages, Complainant extensively uses its MONSTER ENERGY trademarks in connection with clothing, beverage ware, automotive products, sports and fitness equipment, and other products and services. Complainant's goods are sold to consumers in more than 100 other countries. In the United States, Complainant's drinks are sold in over 440,000 retail stores and outlets. Complainant has sold more than 55 billion cans of MONSTER ENERGY drinks since 2002 and now sells approximately 7.7 billion cans per year worldwide. Complainant's worldwide gross sales for the year ending December 31, 2024 was at USD 8.59 billion. Complainant owns the domain name <monsterenergy.com>, under which it maintains its main website since August 19, 2003. Complainant's website receives thousands of unique visitors each month. Complainant has widely marketed and promoted Complainant's marks on apparel, goods across many different industries, and a wide range of merchandise bearing the MONSTER ENERGY trademark, in magazines, publications, through the sponsorship of music festivals and musicians, athletes, athletic endeavors, athletic teams and athletic competitions and through the distribution of point of sale and promotional materials. As of April 2025, the MONSTER ENERGY Facebook page had more than 25 million "likes", the MONSTER ENERGY X account had more than 2.9 million followers and the MONSTER ENERGY Instagram page had more than 9.5 million followers. By unit volume and dollar value, Complainant's MONSTER ENERGY branded drinks are the best-selling energy drinks in the United States and the second best-selling worldwide.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for MONSTER ENERGY in countries around the world, including:

- the United States Trademark Registration No. 3,057,061 for MONSTER ENERGY in Class 32, filed on April 18, 2002, and registered on February 7, 2006;

- the United States Trademark Registration No. 3,044,315 for MONSTER ENERGY in Class 5, filed on May 23, 2003, and registered on January 17, 2006; and

- the United States Trademark Registration No. 4,036,681 for MONSTER ENERGY in Class 32, filed on September 11, 2007, and registered on October 11, 2011.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 6, 2025 and redirects to <monsterenergy4.wordpress.com>, under which operates a website (the Website) prominently displaying the MONSTER ENERGY trademark of Complainant, as well as, per Complaint, other registered trademarks of Complainant, images of Complainant's MONSTER ENERGY products along with messages referencing Complainant and its trademark, such as: "Welcome to the Monster Energy Blog!", "The official Monster Energy Supercross 25 video game has arrived [...]", "Monster Energy offers an exclusive opportunity for adrenaline and combat lovers [...]", "This summer 2025 arrives loaded with new things for Monster Energy fans [...]". Each post on the Website also contains, per Complaint, a hyperlink to Complainant's main website, at "www.monsterenergy.com".

6. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions.

On July 11, 2025, Respondent sent an email communication to Complainant in English, stating that the disputed domain name was registered "solely for educational purposes", as part of a school project for Respondent's academic institution. Respondent claimed that the disputed domain name was never intended for commercial use, profit or infringement. Respondent stated that the content "was purely informative and created as part of a classroom assignment simulating corporate communication, with no advertisements or sales involved". Respondent in this email apologized to Complainant and expressed its willingness to cooperate and, if necessary, voluntarily transfer the disputed domain name to Complainant or delete it. On July 14, 2025, in an email to the Center, Respondent confirmed its willingness to voluntarily transfer the disputed domain name to Complainant and requested that the administrative proceeding be suspended so that the parties may enter into an agreement and close the case.

7. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain name:

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

However, section 4.10 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) provides that: “Where parties to a UDRP proceeding have not been able to settle their dispute prior to the issuance of a panel decision using the ‘standard settlement process’ described above, but where the respondent has nevertheless given its consent on the record to the transfer (or cancellation) remedy sought by the complainant, many panels will order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent. In such cases, the panel gives effect to an understood party agreement as to the disposition of their case (whether by virtue of deemed admission, or on a no-fault basis).” In this case, noting in particular Respondent’s emails of July 11, 2025 and July 14, 2025, Respondent has clearly and fully given its consent on the record to transfer the disputed domain name to Complainant, without request for compensation or any concessions from Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds it appropriate in these circumstances to order transfer of the disputed domain name to Complainant based on Respondent’s unilateral consent to transfer.

8. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <monsterenergy.blog> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2025