

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sandals Resorts International 2000 Inc v. murtaza dar
Case No. D2025-2856

1. The Parties

Complainant is Sandals Resorts International 2000 Inc, Panama, represented by Dechert LLP, United Kingdom.

Respondent is murtaza dar, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <beaches.baby> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 18, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Respondent sent email communications on July 22, 2025. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 24, 2025. Respondent sent email communications on July 24 and 25, 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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2025. Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, August 18, 19, 21, 22, 27, 2025 and September 2, 4 and 10, 2025. Complainant replied to those communications on August 21 and 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 4 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. Factual Background

Complainant has operated a business offering international resort holidays under the BEACHES brand since 1997, when it opened its first holiday resort and it now operates Beaches Resorts in various locations, including Turks & Caicos and Jamaica. Complainant's BEACHES resorts been named the World's Leading Family All-Inclusive Resort brand at the World Travel Awards for 27 years in succession.

Complainant's group is the owner of various BEACHES trademark registrations, including the UK trademark registration No. UK00900169995, BEACHES (figurative), filed on April 1, 1996 and registered on June 5, 1998, for goods and services in international classes 16, 25, 28 and 42, the European Union trademark registration No. 000169995, BEACHES (figurative), filed on April 1, 1996 and registered on June 5, 1998, for goods and services in international classes 16, 25, 28 and 42 and the United States of America trademark registration No. 2951577, BEACHES (word), filed on January 29, 2004 and registered on May 17, 2005 for services in international classes 39 and 43.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 9, 2025 and leads to an inactive website.

5. 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 the Complainant's contentions. Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, August 18, 19, 21, 22, 27, 2025 and September 2, 4 and 10, 2025. Respondent posed several questions for clarifications on the procedure, claiming that he paid for the domain name, that he searched under the trademark "beaches baby" and cannot find who the owner of the trademark is, that he buys domain names and owns many domain names, that he had no knowledge of the trademark upon registration of the disputed domain name, that the disputed domain name was publicly available, that the disputed domain name has been parked since it was purchased, stating also in his email communication of August 18, 2025 that "I would like to transfer the domain ownership to the individual party who has brought this to my attention" and in his email of August 22, 2025 "Take the domain", repeated in his email of September 4, 2025 "I stated numerous times to take the domain". In his email of September 10, 2025 Respondent states "I would like to confirm that I do not wish to contest the complaint filed against me. I have no objection to the immediate transfer or cancellation of the domain name. The name was purchased casually, without any intent to infringe on trademark rights, generate revenue, or create a website. I have already informed GoDaddy that they may release the domain numerous times".

6. 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“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 the Respondent’s emails of August 18 and 22, 2025, as well as September 10, 2025, the Respondent has clearly and fully given his consent on the record to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, without request for compensation or any concessions from the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds it appropriate in these circumstances to order transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant based on the Respondent’s unilateral consent to transfer.

7. 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 <beaches.baby> be transferred to Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: September 16, 2025