

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Monster Energy Company v. Zak John
Case No. D2026-0074

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Zak John, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <juicemonster.online> is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 9, 2026. On January 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 12, 2026, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 14, 2026, 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 January 16, 2026.

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 January 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 8, 2026. The Respondent sent two email communications to the Center on January 14 and 16, 2026. However, the Respondent did not submit any formal response. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on February 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 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 Complainant is a Delaware, United States corporation, that operates in the business of designing, creating, developing, marketing and selling beverages.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks (“the JUICE MONSTER Trademarks”), including the following:

- The United Kingdom wordmark JUICE MONSTER, No UK00002648399, registered on July 22, 2013, for products in classes 5 and 32;
- The European Union wordmark JUICE MONSTER, No 011477783, registered on May 22, 2013, for products in classes 5, 30 and 32;
- The United States wordmark JUICE MONSTER, No 4716750, registered on April 7, 2015, for products in classes 5 and 32.

In 2022, annual total worldwide sales of the Complainant’s beverages branded under the JUICE MONSTER Trademarks were over USD 500 million. Moreover, the Complainant owns the domain name <monsterenergy.com>, on which it displays the JUICE MONSTER Trademarks and products, including an entire page dedicated to JUICE MONSTER beverages. The website receives thousands of unique visitors each month.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 1, 2025, and resolves to a “Coming soon” page displaying JUICE MONSTER mark, appearing to plan the offering of products directly competitive with those of the Complainant.

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 disputed domain name is identical to its JUICE MONSTER Trademarks, as it incorporates the trademark in its entirety. The addition of the “.online” Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) does not add any distinguishing element to the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has neither licensed nor otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks or to register or use a domain name incorporating them. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the terms of the disputed domain name. Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has made no use of the disputed domain name (only a “coming soon” page) and has no demonstrable plan to make any bona fide use of it.

Finally, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name was registered 12 years after the registration of the JUICE MONSTER Trademarks. The Complainant emphasizes that the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant’s prior rights at the time of registration. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose

of disrupting the Complainant's business and/or intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the JUICE MONSTER Trademarks.

The Complainant further argues that, although the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive webpage displaying the message "COMING SOON," such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith use under the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and merely indicated that he intended to raise a formal complaint, and asked why someone was making a Complaint against the Respondent. To date, the Respondent has not filed any formal response. Accordingly, the Respondent has provided no arguments or evidence to rebut the Complainant's assertions or to demonstrate that the Complainant has failed to satisfy one or more of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

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.

Indeed, it appears that the Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the JUICE MONSTER Trademarks and did not authorize the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name incorporating its trademarks. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Moreover, it appears that the Respondent is not making any legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use of the disputed domain name, as the Respondent has made no actual use of the disputed domain name (other than a “coming soon” page) and has no demonstrable intention to put it to any bona fide use.

The Panel also notes the composition of the disputed domain name itself which is identical to the JUICE MONSTER Trademarks combined with the TLD “.online”, which may falsely suggest to Internet users the mistaken belief that they may find an authorized online store of the Complainant.

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

C. 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 has registered the disputed domain name well after the registration of the JUICE MONSTER Trademarks and that, regarding the composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was very likely aware of the Complainant’s trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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. Therefore, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <juicemonster.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/

Christiane Féral-Schuhl

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026