

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Monster Energy Company v. web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner.\*\*\*Maybe for sale on Dynadot Marketplace\*\*\*

Case No. D2025-2967

### 1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner.\*\*\*Maybe for sale on Dynadot Marketplace\*\*\*, Hong Kong, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <unleashtheultrabeast.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 25, 2025. On July 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 27, 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 (Unknown Registrant / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 30, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 26, 2025.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on August 29, 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**

The Complainant is in the business of designing, creating, developing, marketing and selling beverages. Since 2002, the Complainant has been marketing its products under a family of UNLEASH-formative marks, including the UNLEASH THE ULTRA BEAST, UNLEASH THE BEAST and other UNLEASH trademarks which, according to the Complainant, have become recognised by consumers in the USA and throughout the world as designating the Complainant as the source of the Complainant's goods. Accordingly, UNLEASH THE ULTRA BEAST!, UNLEASH THE BEAST and other UNLEASH-formative marks have become extremely valuable to the Complainant.

Products bearing the Complainant's UNLEASH marks are sold in over 417,000 retail stores and outlets throughout the world.

Worldwide adjusted gross sales of the Complainant's branded products for the year ending December 31, 2022 was USD 7.2 billion.

The Complainant has provided the Panel with an impressive schedule of trademark registrations of its family of UNLEASH-formative trademarks throughout the world. These include USA Registration No. 2769364 in respect of the UNLEASH THE BEAST! trademark, registered on September 30, 2003, and USA Registration No. 5633094 in respect of the UNLEASH THE ULTRA BEAST! trademark, registered on December 18, 2018. The Complainant also claims that it owns, among others, the domain name <unleashthebeast.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2025, and resolves to an error webpage.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

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

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has never received consent from the Complainant to use its UNLEASH THE ULTRA BEAST! trademark in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark UNLEASH THE ULTRA BEAST! for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, save for the exclamation mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered and Used in bad Faith**

Having reviewed the available record in this case, the Panel considers it implausible that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name without having the Complainant's UNLEASH THE ULTRA BEAST! trademark in mind, and finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the lack of response putting forward any legitimate non-infringing purpose, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

## **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 <unleashtheultrabeast.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/George R. F. Souter/*

**George R. F. Souter**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 12, 2025