

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Dorpan, S.L., Holazel, S.L. v. Media Insight, Media Insight Group,  
George Alvarez, Media Insight, Media Insight, Media Insight  
Case No. D2025-5340

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainants are Dorpan, S.L. (“First Complainant”) and Holazel, S.L., (“Second Complainant”), both of Spain, represented by Elzaburu SLP, Spain.

The Respondents are Media Insight, Media Insight Group, George Alvarez, media insight, media insight, and media insight, all of United States of America (“United States”), represented by James S. Robertson, Esq., United States.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain names <gardenpuntacana.com>, <gardensuitespuntacana.com>, <levelpuntacana.com>, <meliacaribebeach.com>, <meliacasamaya.com>, <meliacozumelresort.com>, <meliapuertovallartaesort.com>, <meliapuntacanabeach.com>, <meliapuntacana.com>, <meliatropicalcaribe.com>, <meloscabo.com>, <palmarealresort.com>, <paradisusgrandcana.com>, <paradisuslaperlaesort.com>, <paradisusloscabosresort.com>, <paradisusplayadelcarmenresort.com>, <paradisusplayamujeresresort.com>, <paradisuspuntacanahotel.com>, <reserveparadisuspalmareal.com>, <reserveparadisuspuntacana.com>, and <zelpuntacanaresort.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name <paradisuscancun.com>, is registered with Network Solutions, LLC.

GoDaddy.com, LLC and Network Solutions, LLC are jointly and separately referred to below as the “Registrar”.

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 19, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on December 23, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainants to either file separate complaints 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 Complainants filed an amended Complaint on January 5, 2026.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the original due date for Response was January 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(b), the due date for Response was extended to February 1, 2026 at the request of the Respondents. The Response was filed with the Center on February 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on February 11, 2026. 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 Complainants are both part of the Meliá group, which operates chains of hotels worldwide. Its hotels in the Dominican Republic include Meliá Caribe Beach Resort, Meliá Punta Cana Beach (where it offers a guest experience called "The Level"), Paradisus Grand Cana, Paradisus Palma Real Golf & Spa Resort, and Zel Punta Cana. It formerly operated Garden Suites by Meliá (at Punta Cana) and Paradisus Punta Cana. Its hotels in Mexico include Meliá Casa Maya – Cancún, Meliá Cozumel, Meliá Puerto Vallarta, Paradisus Cancún, Paradisus La Perla, Paradisus Los Cabos, Paradisus Playa del Carmen, and ME Cabo. The First Complainant owns trademarks in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- International trademark registration number 449356 for a stylized MELIÁ mark, registered on January 3, 1980, designating multiple jurisdictions;
- Mexican trademark registration number 488872 for PARADISUS, registered on April 25, 1995;
- Dominican Republic trademark registration number 64156 for PARADISUS PUNTA CANA, registered on August 15, 1995;
- Mexican trademark registration number 974215 for a figurative ME BY MELIA mark, registered on February 23, 2007;
- Dominican Republic trademark registration number 97835 for PALMA REAL RESORT, registered on November 15, 1998;
- European Union trademark registration number 005702295 for a figurative V THE LEVEL mark, registered on February 20, 2007; and
- Spanish trademark registration number M2254950 for GARDEN VILLAS, registered on May 1, 2000.

The Second Complainant owns trademarks in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration number 018768794 for a stylized ZEL mark, registered on February 28, 2023.

The Meliá group has registered multiple domain names, including <melia.com> that it uses in connection with a website where it provides information about its hotels.

The Respondent George Alvarez is the President of the Respondent Media Insight, which operates hotel reservation websites on behalf of Vacation Store. Vacation Store is a wholesale and retail travel agency providing vacation packages, hotel accommodation, and travel-related services to various locations, including a number of the Complainant's resorts in the Dominican Republic and Mexico.

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown in the following table.

Date of registration	Disputed domain name	Registrant
February 7, 2003	<meliatropicalcaribe.com>	George Alvarez
August 24, 2004	<paradisuscancun.com>	MEDIA INSIGHT, MEDIA INSIGHT
April 25, 2006	<palmarealresort.com>	George Alvarez
June 26, 2006	<paradisuspuntacanahotel.com>	George Alvarez
February 21, 2008	<meliacozumelresort.com>	George Alvarez
January 19, 2011	<paradisusplayadelcarmenresort.com>	George Alvarez
April 13, 2014	<levelpuntacana.com>	George Alvarez
September 28, 2015	<gardenpuntacana.com>	George Alvarez
October 20, 2015	<paradisulaperlaresort.com>	George Alvarez
June 30, 2017	<reserveparadisuspuntacana.com>	George Alvarez
June 30, 2017	<paradisusloscabosresort.com>	George Alvarez
June 30, 2017	<reserveparadisuspalmareal.com>	George Alvarez
June 3, 2018	<paradisusplayamujeresresort.com>	George Alvarez
August 1, 2018	<meliacaribebeach.com>	George Alvarez
August 1, 2018	<meliapuntacanabeach.com>	George Alvarez
June 16, 2021	<paradisusgrandcana.com>	George Alvarez
December 1, 2021	<meloscabo.com>	George Alvarez
November 10, 2022	<meliapuertovallartaesort.com>	George Alvarez
December 25, 2022	<gardensuitespuntacana.com>	George Alvarez
September 15, 2023	<meliapuntacana.com>	MEDIA INSIGHT
November 7, 2024	<zelpuntacanaresort.com>	MEDIA INSIGHT, Media Insight Group
January 2, 2025	<meliacasamaya.com>	MEDIA INSIGHT, Media Insight Group

The disputed domain names resolve to similar websites in English, each promoting a beach resort. Most of the websites promote beach resorts operated by the Complainants, except for three that promote a resort formerly operated by the Complainants that closed in May 2024 (i.e., Garden Suites by Meliá, featured on the websites associated with the disputed domain names <gardenpuntacana.com>, <gardensuitespuntacana.com>, and <reserveparadisuspalmareal.com>), and one website that promotes a resort operated by a competitor of the Complainants (i.e., SLS Playa Mujeres, featured on the website associated with the disputed domain name <paradisusplayamujeresresort.com>). A further disputed domain name does not correspond to the name of the Complainants' resort that is featured on the associated site (i.e., the disputed domain name <paradisuspuntacanahotel.com> resolves to a site for Zel Punta Cana).

Each of the websites associated with the disputed domain names displays a title that references the specific resort that is the subject of that site. The websites for the Complainants' resorts display the Complainants' marks. They use expressions in the first person such as "our wonderfully equipped Kids Zone"; "any of our 12 restaurants"; "play tennis on our courts"; "atmosphere of our centre"; "services and facilities that we make available"; and "we have something specially designed for you" (emphasis added). In two cases, (i.e., the websites associated with the disputed domain names <gardenpuntacana.com> and <meliapuntacana.com>) the titles display the name "Vacation Store Miami ®" in a smaller, gray font above the resort name. All the websites display a homepage footer that includes the name "@Vacation Store Miami". Bookings may be made via contact telephone numbers.

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainants**

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to their MELIA, GRAN MELIA, PARADISUS, ME, PALMA REAL, LEVEL, GARDEN VILLAS, and ZEL marks.

The websites associated with the disputed domain names refer to "® Vacation Store Miami". The Complainant states that it does not know if the owner of that trademark is also the registrant of the disputed domain names.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainants have not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondents to register or use the disputed domain names nor the prior trademarks. The disputed domain names do not in any way identify the Respondents, but rather the Complainants. The high reputation of the MELIA brands makes highly unlikely that the Respondents will be able to claim any kind of right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names, but a deliberate practice for registering domain names designed to impersonate the Complainants and/or create the impression that it exists a non-existent affiliation with them.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The websites associated with the disputed domain names' ultimate purpose is to create the image that they are somehow linked to the Complainants' group and to fraudulently pass themselves off as a service that originates from the Complainants' group. The Respondents have sought to attract users to certain disputed domain names through the reproduction of the term MELIA (that appears as part of most of the disputed domain names or is mentioned on the associated websites as part of the hotel name or in its description), which corresponds to the Complainants' well-known mark. This has been done with the purpose of improperly obtaining fraudulent or unfair payments from people who believe that they are contracting with Meliá and thereby hindering the activities of the Complainants.

### **B. Respondents**

The Respondents contend that the Complainant has not satisfied any of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Response uses "Respondent" to refer to both the Respondents and Vacation Store.

Notably, the Respondents contend that the Complainants failed to reveal material facts. The Parties have a longstanding business relationship. As recently as 2022, the Complainants' parent company, Meliá, described the Respondents in writing as its business partner. The Respondents have been contractually engaged to arrange bookings and host websites promoting the Complainants' resorts with their full knowledge and approval. The webpages direct customers to the Complainants' resorts; they do not divert them. The Complainants have actively supported the use of the webpages and benefitted from the promotions and bookings generated through them. The Respondents do not own, control, operate, or otherwise have any business interest in any hotels.

The trademarks and the disputed domain names are not identical or confusingly similar. The Complainants' trademarks were not registered until years after a number of the Respondents' domain names. Thus, at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, the Complainants did not own any trademarks in the United States. Many of the disputed domain names are nothing more than generic or descriptive names.

The Respondents should be considered as having rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainants have licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondents to use the trade names, service marks, and the websites. The Respondents have had business dealings with the

Complainants for over 25 years. Throughout that time, the Respondents have operated webpages on behalf of the Complainants. The Complainants have been aware of the operation of the webpages and have approved the Respondents' use. Emails regarding the websites operated by the Respondents acknowledge the webpages and include links from Meliá requesting the Respondents to update the webpages. The Complainants have requested changes to be made to the webpages, provided photos and fact sheets to the Respondents in order to make those changes, and visited Vacation Store's office to review the webpages. In addition to requesting corrections to the webpages, letters from Vacation Store were signed by Meliá in order to fund advertising on webpages. Based upon the relationship of the Parties, the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names constitutes fair use. The Respondents were using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. The Respondents had a contract which authorized them to resell the rooms. The webpages were used to provide travel information, resort descriptions, and booking assistance for the Complainants' resorts. The Respondents never attempted to sell the disputed domain names. To the contrary, the Complainants attempted to buy one of the disputed domain names, and the Respondents refused to sell, resulting in punitive actions by the Complainants that were resolved via a threat of litigation in 2013.

The disputed domain names were not registered and used in bad faith. The Parties have had business dealings for over 25 years. The Complainants have known about the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names for 22 years. The Complainants have provided advertising budgets to the Respondent to promote the webpages. The Respondents have spent substantial amounts of resources promoting the disputed domain names and building up the associated websites. The Complainants have done nothing in a timely matter to protect their alleged exclusive interest in the disputed domain names. In fact, the Complainants encouraged the Respondents to operate and build up the disputed domain names and websites, since the Complainants received income from the sale of the hotel rooms promoted on the websites. This action should be barred by the Complainants' failure to timely protect their marks.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Preliminary Issues**

#### **A. Consolidation: Multiple Complainants**

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed by two Complainants. Both Complainants are part of the Meliá group: the First Complainant is a subsidiary of Meliá Hotels International while the Second Complainant is a joint venture between Meliá Hotels International and Mr. Rafael Nadal. Both Complainants own trademarks at issue in this dispute and the disputed domain names incorporating their respective trademarks are used in the same or a similar way.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have a common grievance against the Respondents and that it is efficient to permit the consolidation of their complaints. Therefore, the Complainants are referred to below collectively as "the Complainant" except as otherwise indicated.

#### **B. 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 disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment specifically on the Complainant's request but rather confirmed that one of them (i.e., George Alvarez) is the President of the other (i.e. Media Insight) and treated them both, together with Vacation Store, as the Respondent.

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.

There is no dispute that the disputed domain name registrants are under common control, as one of them is the President of the other. Moreover, the Panel notes that all the disputed domain names share the same contact email address and all but two share the same contact street address. The associated websites were all designed with the same format and template. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are under common control.

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 disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

## **6.2. Substantive Issues**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the 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.

### **A. 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 trademark and the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of MELIA, PARADISUS, PARADISUS PUNTA CANA, ME BY MELIA, PALMA REAL RESORT, V THE LEVEL, and GARDEN VILLAS trademarks, among others, for the purposes of the Policy. Given that the figurative elements in two of these marks cannot be represented in domain names for technical reasons, the Panel will not take them into account in its assessment of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.2.1 and 1.10.

The MELIA mark is incorporated in the five disputed domain names , <meliatropicalcaribe.com>, <meliacozumelresort.com>, <meliacaribebeach.com>, <meliapuntacanabeach.com>, <meliapuertovallartaesort.com>, <meliapuntacana.com>, and <meliasamaya.com>, as their respective initial elements. Despite the addition of place names and words (such as “tropical”, “resort” and “beach”), the MELIA mark remains clearly recognizable in these seven disputed domain names.

The PARADISUS mark is incorporated in the seven disputed domain names <paradisuscancun.com>, <paradisusloscabosresort.com>, <paradisusplayamujeresresort.com>, <paradisusgrandcana.com>, <reserveparadisuspalmareal.com>, <paradisuslaperlaresort.com>, <paradisusplayadelcarmenresort.com>, <paradisuspuntacanahotel.com>, and <reserveparadisuspuntacana.com>. Despite the addition of place names and words (i.e., “resort” and “hotel”), the PARADISUS mark remains clearly recognizable in these nine disputed domain names. In addition, the disputed domain names <paradisuspuntacanahotel.com>, and <reserveparadisuspuntacana.com> each incorporate the PARADISUS PUNTA CANA mark which, despite the addition of the word “hotel” or “reserve”, also remains clearly recognizable in these two disputed domain names.

The PALMA REAL RESORT mark is incorporated in the disputed domain name <palmarealresort.com>.

The ZEL mark is incorporated in the disputed domain name <zelpuntacanaresort.com> as its initial element. Despite the addition of a place name (Punta Cana) and the word “resort”, the ZEL mark is clearly recognizable in this disputed domain name.

The GARDEN VILLAS mark is partly incorporated in the disputed domain names <gardenpuntacana.com> and <gardensuitespuntacana.com>, which contain the initial term (“garden”), omit the term “villas”, and add a place name (Punta Cana). The V THE LEVEL mark is partly incorporated in the disputed domain name <levelpuntacana.com>, which contains the only word in that mark (“level”), omits the “v”, and adds a place name (Punta Cana). The ME BY MELIA mark is partly incorporated in the disputed domain name <meloscabo.com>, which contains the initial term in the mark (“me”), omits the phrase “by Melia”, and adds a misspelt place name (Los Cabo[s]). The Panel considers that each of these disputed domain names appears prima facie intended to target one or other of the Complainant’s marks, an intention that is confirmed by the content of the associated websites, which variously present “Garden Suites by *Meliá*”, “The Level at *Meliá* Punta Cana”, and “ME CABO Resort, Hotel Me Cabo by *Meliá*” (emphasis added).

The only additional element in each disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) extension (“.com”) which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name <palmarealresort.com> is identical to the PALMA REAL RESORT mark, and the other disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the MELIA, PARADISUS, PARADISUS PUNTA CANA, ME BY MELIA, V THE LEVEL, and/or GARDEN VILLAS marks for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, 1.10, 1.11.1, and 1.15.

The Respondent argues that the Complainant did not own any trademarks in the United States at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. However, the Panel notes the global nature of the Internet and Domain Name System and recalls that the jurisdictions where the trademarks are valid is not considered relevant to panel assessment under the first element. Further, the fact that a domain name may have been registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights does not by itself preclude a finding of identity or confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.1.2 and 1.1.3. In any case, the dates of all the trademark registrations set out in Section 4 of this Decision are earlier than the dates of registration of the corresponding disputed domain names.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established with respect to all disputed domain names.

## **B. 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.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant’s marks, or parts of them, in combinations with place names and descriptive words in such a way that most refer to one or other of the

Complainant's actual, former or proposed resorts in the Dominican Republic or Mexico or, in one case (<levelpuntacana.com>), a guest experience offered in one of those resorts. The disputed domain name <paradisusplayamujeresresort.com> resolves to a website that promotes a beach resort operated by a competitor of the Complainant. The other 21 disputed domain names resolve to websites that promote beach resorts currently or formerly operated by the Complainant but, due to their layout, text, and use of the Complainant's trademarks, it is not clear to Internet users visiting these websites that they are not operated by the Complainant. The mention of "@Vacation Store Miami" in the homepage footers, and the subtle addition of "Vacation Store Miami ®" in two of the website titles, are insufficient to clarify the relationship between the Parties or to constitute a disclaimer. Nor does there appear to be any link from these websites to the Complainant's own websites. The Respondent uses these 21 disputed domain names in the same way, which demonstrates a pattern of conduct. The Complainant submits that it has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain names. These circumstances do not indicate that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2.

Further, the Respondent's names are "George Alvarez" and "Media Insight" or "Media Insight Group" and their associate's name is "Vacation Store Miami", none of which resembles the disputed domain names. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names.

Having reviewed the Complainant's evidence, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Respondent alleges that, in the course of a business relationship, the Complainant has been aware of the Respondent's operation of the websites associated with the disputed domain names and has approved the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names. The Respondent's evidence demonstrates the existence of a longstanding business relationship between the Complainant's group and the Respondent's associate, Vacation Store, according to which Vacation Store has been authorized to market the Complainant's resorts. The Panel takes note that most of the disputed domain names were indeed registered after that business relationship began, with the possible exception of the disputed domain name <meliatropicalcaribe.com> that was registered prior to the earliest correspondence on record between the Parties or their associates, which is a fax dated October 15, 2003 from the Acting Regional Director Sales and Marketing of Sol Meliá Punta Cana to Vacation Store. A business relationship was clearly in place from at least as early as 2004, when the Regional Director Sales and Marketing of Sol Meliá Punta Cana offered special discount accommodation rates to Vacation Store for reservations at two of its resorts (Meliá Caribe Tropical and Paradisus Punta Cana). These rates were valid only for Vacation Store, which countersigned them. In 2006, Leisure Sales and Marketing of Sol Group Corporation (evidently an associate of the Complainant) agreed to fund Vacation Store's marketing plan for 2007 to increase sales. Despite a contractual dispute in 2013, their relationship appears to remain active. As recently as October 28, 2022, Meliá's Regional Sales Manager in the Dominican Republic shared updated marketing material with Vacation Store Miami, that it addressed as "Estimado Socio Comercial" (meaning "Dear Business Partner"). Vacation Store is also in possession of promotional rate sheets and codes for the 2026-27 season for a number of the Complainant's resorts featured on websites associated with the disputed domain names.

However, although the Complainant's group was aware that Vacation Store markets the Complainant's resorts, including online, it was not necessarily aware of the websites associated with the disputed domain names. Vacation Store's marketing plan for 2007 budgeted for newspaper advertising, direct mailing, and radio, and made only a brief reference to "Internet". The President of Vacation Store declares that Meliá's General Sales Manager in the United States would often visit Vacation Store's office and review its webpages, but this claim is unsubstantiated. The Respondent's evidence shows that it operated a website in connection with the domain name <travelquotes.com> and that Vacation Store's email address used the domain name <vacstore.net> and later <vacationstoremiami.com>. On December 20, 2019, Meliá sent Vacation Store a link to marketing material with a request that it update the Paradisus Hotel information on its website, and the October 28, 2022 email from Meliá's Regional Sales Manager also shared marketing

material in digital format. Despite this, none of the correspondence on record refers specifically to any of the disputed domain names. While the Respondent alleges that the Complainant offered to purchase the disputed domain name <paradisuscancun.com> in 2012, this is not substantiated. The Respondent and the President of Vacation Store both declare that the Complainant never objected to the use of the disputed domain names but that may have been because the Complainant was unaware of their existence. Therefore, the evidence does not support the Respondent's allegations that the Complainant has been aware of the Respondent's operation of the websites associated with the disputed domain names and that the Complainant has approved the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names

Having reviewed the Respondent's evidence, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing.

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

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

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy contains two requirements that apply conjunctively, meaning that a complainant must show not only that each disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith but also that it is being used in bad faith. The fourth of these circumstances is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered during the period 2003 to 2025, after the registration of the trademark or trademarks with which each is confusingly similar, as set out in Section 6.2A and Section 4 above, respectively. The disputed domain names resolve to websites that promote beach resorts that, with one exception, are currently or formerly operated by the Complainant. The Respondent does not deny its longstanding awareness of the Complainant; on the contrary, it alleges that the Parties have had business dealings with each other for over 25 years. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when the Respondent registered the disputed domain names.

Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent or its associate Vacation Store had explicit instructions or contractual terms concerning domain name registration within the context of Vacation Store's business relationship with the Complainant's group. Nor is there evidence of any instance in which the Respondent gave notice to the Complainant's group of the registration of any disputed domain name, or other circumstances that would give rise to the inference that the Respondent reasonably understood that the Complainant authorized its registration of the disputed domain names.

As regards use, the disputed domain name <paradisusplayamujeresresort.com> resolves to a website that promotes a beach resort operated by a competitor of the Complainant. That is clearly a use in bad faith within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Although the other 21 disputed domain names resolve to websites that promote beach resorts currently or formerly operated by the Complainant, and although the Complainant may indeed honor reservations made at its resorts by Vacation Store, for whom the Respondent operates the websites, the websites nevertheless give the false impression that they are operated by the Complainant. Given the Panel's findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel is unable to find on the basis of the record that the Complainant has ever approved the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the circumstances regarding the use of these other 21 disputed domain names also fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel takes note that the Complainant's group appears to have a continuing business relationship with the Respondent's associate, Vacation Store Miami, that was not disclosed in the Complaint. However, given the misleading nature of the disputed domain names and the content of the associated websites, the

existence of such a relationship does not prevent the Complainant from demonstrating bad faith under the Policy. The mere existence of a specific commercial relationship does not mean that the Respondent may take liberties with the Complainant's trademark without the consent or authorization of the Complainant. In this regard, the Complainant's group does not appear to have consented to George Alvarez or Media Insight registering domain names on behalf of the Complainant.

Therefore, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established with respect to all disputed domain names.

## **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 names <gardenpuntacana.com>, <gardensuitespuntacana.com>, <levelpuntacana.com>, <meliacaribebeach.com>, <meliacasamaya.com>, <meliacozumelresort.com>, <meliapuertovallarta.com>, <meliapuntacanabeach.com>, <meliapuntacana.com>, <meliatropicalcaribe.com>, <meloscabo.com>, <palmarealresort.com>, <paradisuscancun.com>, <paradisugrandcana.com>, <paradisuslaperlaresort.com>, <paradisusloscabosresort.com>, <paradisusplayadelcarmenresort.com>, <paradisusplayamujeresresort.com>, <paradisuspuntacanahotel.com>, <reserveparadisuspalmareal.com>, <reserveparadisuspuntacana.com>, and <zelpuntacanaresort.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Matthew Kennedy/*

**Matthew Kennedy**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 25, 2026