

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v. Lady First, NANTAWADEE SAOON, Rungrote Pholsiri, Arisara ufaricesKushita, pichet pichet, Pimniti Thummultri and chefo saka
Case No. D2025-3435

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco, Monaco, represented by De Gaulle Fleurance & Associés, France.

The Respondents are Lady First, Thailand (“Respondent 1”), NANTAWADEE SAOON, Thailand (“Respondent 2”), Rungrote Pholsiri, Thailand (“Respondent 3”), Arisara ufaricesKushita, Thailand (“Respondent 4”), pichet pichet, Thailand (“Respondent 5”), Pimniti Thummultri, Thailand (“Respondent 6”) and chefo saka, Thailand (“Respondent 7”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <monte-carlo-slot.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc. (“Registrar A”).

The disputed domain names <montecarloth.co>, <montecarloth.info>, <montecarloth.net> and <montecarloth.org> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (“Registrar B”). The disputed domain name <montecarloth.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (“Registrar C”). The disputed domain name <montecarlothmber.com> is registered with Name.com Inc, (Registrar D”).

(Registrars A, B, C and D are referred to collectively as the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 26, 2025. On August 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 26 2025, Registrar B transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names <montecarloth.co>, <montecarloth.info>, <montecarloth.net> and <montecarloth.org> which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. On August 26, 2025, Registrar C transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names <montecarloth.com>. On August 27, 2025, Registrars A, and D transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names <monte-carlo-slot.com>, and <montecarlothmber.com> respectively.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 1, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 5, 2025.

Respondent 4 sent an email to the Center on September 1, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any formal response.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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

Founded in 1863 by Sovereign Decree, the Complainant has been granted a monopoly for casino and gambling activities for the Principality of Monaco. The Complainant owns and has been operating the Casino de Monte Carlo also known as the Casino de Monaco for more than 150 years. It also owns and operates various other casinos and gaming rooms and cultural and leisure resorts in Monaco including the Monte-Carlo Bay Casino, Jimmy’z Monte-Carlo night club, Monte-Carlo Golf Club and the Monte-Carlo Country Club.

The Complainant owns the following relevant registered trade marks in Monaco:

- Trade Mark Registration No. 96.17407 for CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO registered on October 30, 1996; and
- Trade Mark Registration No. 14.30170 for MONTE-CARLO registered on December 31, 2013.

(individually and collectively referred to as the “Trade Mark”).

The disputed domain names (the “Domain Names”) and the websites they resolve to (the “Websites”) are set out below:

No.	Domain Name	Creation Date	Respondents	Registrars	Websites and Comments
1	<montecarloth.com>	October 24, 2023	Respondent 1	Registrar C	Resolved to a gambling website in Thai bearing the name “MONTE CARLO” and a logo comprising the words MONTE CARLO and “www.montecarloth.com” within a rectangle with a square shaped dice bearing the capital letter “M” on the

					<p>three visible faces on the left of the rectangle. There are also images of women wearing revealing attire.</p> <p>Now inactive</p>
2	<montecarloth.net>	November 22, 2024	Respondent 2	Registrar B	<p>Resolved to a gambling website bearing the name "MONTECARLOTH" and a logo comprising the words "MONTE CARLO" and the capital letters "TH" separately under it within a rectangle with a square shaped dice bearing the capital letter "M" on the three visible faces on the left of the rectangle and "www.montecloth.net" under the logo. There are also images of women wearing revealing attire.</p> <p>Now inactive</p>
3	<montecarloth.co>	January 25, 2025	Respondent 3	Registrar B	<p>Resolves to a gambling website in Thai bearing the name "montecarloth" and a logo comprising the words MONTE CARLO and the letters "th" in a different font to MONTE CARLO forming the word "MONTECARLOTH" and "www.montecarloth.co" and with a square shaped dice bearing the capital letter "M" on the three visible faces on the left of the rectangle. There are also images of women wearing revealing attire.</p>
4	<montecarloth.info>	January 24, 2025	Respondent 4	Registrar B	<p>Resolved to a gambling website in Thai bearing the name "MONTECARLOTH" and images of women wearing revealing attire.</p> <p>Now inactive.</p>

5	<montecarloth.org>	December 27, 2024	Respondent 5	Registrar B	Inactive - Redirects users to an error page stating "Connection timed out-Error code 522".
6	<monte-carlo-slot.com>	March 31, 2025	Respondent 6	Registrar A	Resolves to a gambling website in Thai bearing the name MONTE CARLO and with a square shaped dice bearing the capital letter "M" on the three visible faces on the left of the first rectangle. There are also images of women wearing revealing attire.
7	<montecarlothmber.com>	October 30, 2023	Respondent 7	Registrar D	Resolved to a gambling website login portal in Thai bearing the name MONTE CARLO and with a square shaped dice bearing the capital letter "M" on the three visible faces on the left of the first rectangle.

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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are identical and/or confusingly similar to the Trade Mark in which it has rights, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Domain Names, and that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests transfer of the Domain Names.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. On September 1, 2025, the Respondent 4 sent an email communication stating: "I have successfully deleted the domain montecarloth.info".

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the Domain Name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple Domain Name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The Domain Name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the Domain Names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following:

- (1) All the Domain Names include the Trade Mark as part of the Domain Names.
- (2) The second-level domain of the Domain Names 1-5 are identical with the letters "TH" added after the MONTE CARLO Trade Mark.
- (3) The Websites connected to Domain Names 6-7 bear the Logo which includes within it the website address to Domain Name 1.
- (4) Domain Names 2-5 are registered with the same Registrar.
- (5) Aside from Domain Name 5 which was inactive and Domain Name 2 which was in English, all the Websites when active were in the Thai language.
- (6) All the registrants have addresses in Thailand and "@gmail.com" email addresses.
- (7) Respondent 2 and Respondent 4 have email addresses with the same initial letters "ufa".
- (8) Respondent 1 and Respondent 7 have the same email addresses.
- (9) Websites 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 all have almost identical logos all bearing the MONTE CARLO Trade Mark.
- (10) Websites 2 and 3 bear the name "MONTECARLOTH" and a logo comprising the words "MONTE CARLO" and the capital letters "TH" separately, implicitly forming the word "MONTECARLOTH".
- (11) Websites 1-4 and 6 all have/had identical style of images of women wearing revealing attire.
- (12) The Respondents failed to file responses save for Respondent 4 who said that Domain Name 4 was "successfully deleted".

The evidence submitted points to the fact that all the Domain Names are subject of common control by the Respondents. The above pattern evidences common conduct based on the registration and use of the Domain Names and that such conduct interferes with the Trade Mark. The Respondents had the opportunity but did not respond to the Complaint. As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different Domain Name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's Trade Mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the other terms here, “th”, “thmber” and “slot”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. 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 Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Trade Mark when it registered the Domain Names given the reputation of the Trade Mark particular in the gambling/casino industry. Further both Respondent 2 and Respondent 3 have been Respondents in previous UDRP cases brought by the Complainant in relation to its trade mark MONACO which resulted in their domain names being transferred to the Complainant (*Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v. ufavision seoteam*; *Rungrote Pholsiri*; *linda aja*; *janchai mahanakorn*; and *chatchalerm noisanguan*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3653](#) and *Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v. hjiu Bnn, NANTAWADEE SAOON*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1928](#)). It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Names.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

“Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers),

panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent's claim not to have been aware of the complainant's mark."

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent's choice of the seven Domain Names without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The Domain Names fall into the category stated above and the Panel finds that the registration is in bad faith.

The Domain Names are also being used in bad faith. The unauthorised use of the Complainant's Trade Mark without authorisation are calculated to mislead Internet users to believe its affiliation with the Complainant. Further, the number of Domain Names involved is an indication of serial cybersquatting targeting the Complainant and its Trade Mark.

The content of some of the Websites was calculated to give the impression they have been authorised by or connected to the Complainant when this is not the case. These Websites were set up to deliberately mislead Internet users that they are connected to, authorised by, or affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent employed the fame of the Trade Mark to mislead Internet users into visiting the Websites instead of the Complainant's. From the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, by misleading Internet users into believing that the Websites and the gambling services offered are those of or authorised or endorsed by the Complainant.

It is highly likely that Internet users, when typing the Domain Names into their browser or finding them through a search engine, would have been looking for a site operated by the Complainant rather than the Respondent. The Domain Names are likely to confuse Internet users trying to find the Complainant's official websites. Such confusion will inevitably result due to the fact that all the Domain Names comprise the Trade Mark in its entirety.

The Panel therefore also concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that some of the Domain Names may have been or are inactive or resolved to error pages does not prevent a finding of bad faith given that the distinctiveness and reputation of the Trade Mark, the composition of the Domain Names, the lack of a response from the Respondent, and the fact that the Domain Names are all under common control of a single person or entity which are using the other Domain Names for nefarious purposes.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Names <monte-carlo-slot.com>, <montecarloth.co>, <montecarloth.com>, <montecarloth.info>, <montecarlothmber.com>, <montecarloth.net> and <montecarloth.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: November 10, 2025