

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Net Holding A. Ş., Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme A.Ş. v. Yasin Akgul,
Kuzey Yilmaz
Case No. D2026-1441

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Net Holding A. Ş., Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme A.Ş., Türkiye, represented by Sołtysiński Kawecki & Szlęzak, - Kancelaria Radców Prawnych i Adwokatów spółka komandytowa, Poland.

The Respondents are Yasin Akgul, Türkiye and Kuzey Yilmaz, Malta.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <meritqueen.com> and <meritqueen.net> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain names <meritqueen220.com>, <meritqueen221.com> and <meritqueen222.com> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 3, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 8, 2026 the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy / Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 10, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant 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 Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 13, 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 April 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 4, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on May 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Zeynep Yasaman as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 Net Holding A.Ş. (“Net Holding”) and its subsidiary Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme A.Ş. (“Merit Turizm”), both joint stock companies organized under the laws of Türkiye and members of the same corporate group. Net Holding operates in the hospitality, casino, gaming and betting sectors in Türkiye, Cyprus, Montenegro, Croatia and Bulgaria, under the MERIT brand, and is described by the Complainants as a regional gambling leader in Cyprus and one of the largest casino operators worldwide. Both Net Holding and Merit Turizm are listed on the Istanbul Stock Exchange.

The Complainants have provided evidence of a family of trademark registrations consisting of, or incorporating, the element MERIT, including, among others:

- Turkish trademark MERIT INTERNATIONAL, registration no. 171909, registered on June 16, 1997, in classes 39, 41, and 42.
- Turkish trademark MERIT ROYAL HOTEL CASINO SPA, registration no. 2012 97386, registered on September 9, 2015, in classes 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45.
- Turkish trademark MERIT POKER, registration no. 2013 106696, registered on August 25, 2015, in classes 28 and 35.
- European trademark MERIT ROYAL HOTEL&CASINO&SPA, registration no. 016172389, registered on May 24, 2017, in classes 9, 16, 21, 24, 28, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, and 43.
- International trademark MERIT, registration no. 1725494, registered on December 23, 2022, in classes 9, 41, and 42.

According to the documents submitted by the Complainants, Merit Turizm filed an application before the Turkish Patent and Trademark Office (“TÜRKPATENT”) for the recognition of the MERIT trademark as a well-known trademark. Upon review of the TÜRKPATENT online database, the Panel notes that the application was filed on November 18, 2024, and remains pending as of the date of this Decision. The Panel further notes, however, that in *Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme Anonim Şirketi v. Fedlan Kilicaslan, G&F Company Group NV / Redsoft N.V.*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1398](#), the panel recorded that the Ankara IP Court had accepted the Complainant’s MERIT INTERNATIONAL trademark as well known among the relevant target public.

The Complainants operate under the websites “www.netholding.com” and “www.merithotels.com.”

The disputed domain names <meritqueen.com> and <meritqueen.net> were registered on July 1, 2024, in the name of Yasin Akgul, with a postal address in Türkiye. The disputed domain names <meritqueen220.com>, <meritqueen221.com> and <meritqueen222.com> were registered on October 8, 2025, in the name of kuzey yilmaz, with a postal address in Malta.

At the time of this Decision, the Panel was unable to access the websites at the disputed domain names. Based on the screenshots submitted by the Complainants, the Panel notes that:

- The disputed domain name <meritqueen.com> resolved to a website prominently displaying the sign “MERITQUEEN” together with a stylized shield-and-crown device in the upper-left corner. The website, presented in both Turkish and English versions, was headed “Meritqueen – Meritqueen Giriş Güncel” / “Meritqueen – Meritqueen Login Updated” and held itself out as the “official login address” of the so-called Meritqueen platform, expressly cautioning visitors not to trust third parties using the same name and inviting them to click a pink call-to-action button reading “MERITQUEEN GİRİŞ” / “MERITQUEEN LOGIN”. The website further stated that, in the event of any issues accessing the site, users could continue to access it by following the current address. The site offered and promoted a range of online gambling and betting services, including slot games, live casino games, sports betting, and e-sports betting. The landing page featured large promotional banners emphasizing “fast and secure payment methods” with instant withdrawals.

- The disputed domain name <meritqueen.net> resolved to a website prominently displaying the sign “MERITQUEEN” together with the same stylized shield-and-crown device appearing on the website at <meritqueen.com>. The website, available in both Turkish and English versions, was structured as a blog-style page headed “MeritQueen – Resmi Giriş Adresi” / “MeritQueen – Official Login Address” and held itself out as the “official login address” of the so-called MeritQueen platform, warning visitors against “fake login pages” and inviting them to click a call-to-action button reading “TIKLA MERİTQUEEN'E GİRİŞ YAP” / “CLICK HERE TO ACCESS MERITQUEEN”. The site offered and promoted a range of online gambling and betting services, including slot games, live casino games, and various cash and free-spin promotions.

- The disputed domain name <meritqueen220.com> resolved to a full-fledged online casino and sports-betting website prominently displaying, in its header and footer, the sign “MERITQUEEN” together with a figurative element consisting of a shield bearing a stylized crown device. A notice at the top of the page informed visitors that “Our current address is meritqueen221.com. Our next address will be meritqueen222.com.” A top banner headed “MERITQUEEN'DE KAZANCIN OTEL GÜVENCESİNDE!” (“At MeritQueen, your winnings are under the hotel's guarantee!”) stated that “all your investment and withdrawal transactions are under the guarantee of Merit Hotel” and that “MeritQueen is a Merit company” (“MeritQueen Bir Merit Şirketidir!”). Additional banners advertised a “₺5,000 trial bonus”, a “₺1,250 gift on a ₺1,250 deposit”, and a “withdrawal guarantee within 5 minutes”. The website offered a wide range of online gambling and betting services, organized in a left-hand menu including “Slots”, “Live Casino”, “Most Popular Games”, “Before the Match” and “Live Matches” sports betting, “Aviator”, “Bingo”, and “TV Games”, and displayed extensive catalogs of slot games, live casino tables, and the logos of third-party game providers. The footer of the website further displayed the MERITQUEEN shield-and-crown device alongside the logo of the German football club RB Leipzig and the legend “RB LEİPZİG RESMİ SPONSORU” (“Official Sponsor of RB Leipzig”), together with the following corporate notice: <meritqueen.com> is owned and operated by Mega Technology Ltd.

The Complainants also submitted excerpts from a Turkish consumer-complaint website, in which users of the “Meritqueen” platform report serious irregularities concerning its operation, in particular regarding withdrawal of funds.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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 they hold rights in the family of trademarks incorporating MERIT element and that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to their trademarks. According to the Complainants, all the disputed domain names incorporate the dominant element MERIT, which is included in all Complainants' trademarks without any alteration; the element “QUEEN” is intended to evoke association with the element “ROYAL” included in numerous Complainants' trademarks; systematic

creation of variations, such as from “meritroyal” to “meritking” to “meritqueen” demonstrates a deliberate strategy to create confusingly similar domain names; the addition of numerals (such as “220”) is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainants’ trademarks; and the use of different Top Level Domains (“.com”, “.net”) is irrelevant to the confusing similarity analysis under established UDRP precedent.

The Complainants further contend that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names and that the disputed domain names are registered and are being used in bad faith. In that regards, the Complainants argue that the operation of the websites available under the disputed domain names aims at creating confusion among the consumers as to the origin of services provided under “Meritqueen” brand and free-ride on the reputation of the Complainants’ trademarks. According to the Complainants, it is not a coincidence that the Respondents chose the trademark and the disputed domain names, which incorporate the dominant element of the well-known trademarks used by the world’s eighth largest casino operator. The Complainants argue that the Respondents’ lack of rights or legitimate interests and bad faith are obvious, as the Respondents use not only the distinctive word element “Merit”, but also identical figurative elements, including the cross design. Moreover, the Respondents’ websites contain direct misleading references to the Complainants. The Complainants indicate that they never agreed to the use of the Complainants’ trademarks by the Respondents or any other person involved in the operation of Meritqueen websites. According to the Complainants, it can be assumed that the Respondents were aware of the MERIT trademarks since the MERIT trademarks are well-known and enjoy a reputation, as Net Holding is the world’s 8th largest casino operator, and both the Respondents and the Complainants are targeting their services to the Turkish public. The Complainants add that users of the Merit Queen website report serious irregularities concerning its operation, and that the background of this case clearly demonstrates a long-term pattern of registering domain names with the intention of confusing consumers and free-riding on the reputation of the Complainants’ trademarks.

B. Respondent

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Complainants

It is well established that a single complaint may be brought under the Policy by multiple complainants where the multiple complainants have a common grievance against the respondent.

One circumstance of a common grievance is where the complainants share a common legal interest in trademarks allegedly affected by the respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. Multiple complainants may establish a common legal interest if the multiple complainants form part of a single entity such as where individual companies are part of a larger corporate group. See *Fulham Football Club (1987) Limited, Tottenham Hotspur Public Limited, West Ham United Football Club PLC, Manchester United Limited, The Liverpool Football Club and Athletic Grounds Limited v. Domains by Proxy, Inc./Official Tickets Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0331](#).

The Complainants have established that both companies organized under the laws of Türkiye and members of the same corporate group. The Complainants therefore have a specific common grievance against the Respondents.

Meanwhile, the Respondents did not respond to the Complaint. The Panel thus determines that the above circumstances entitle the Complainants (referred to below as “the Complainant”) to bring this Complaint against the Respondents.

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 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 disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties.

Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s) (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2).

As regards common control, although the formally named registrants are different, the Panel considers that the following factors taken together establish that the disputed domain names are under common control:

- all five disputed domain names share an identical and unusual second-level component – “meritqueen” – to which only short numerical suffixes (“220”, “221”, “222”) are added in three of them;
- the disputed domain names registered in the name of each registrant were registered on the same day in batches: <meritqueen.com> and <meritqueen.net> were both registered on July 1, 2024, with the same registrar (NameCheap, Inc.), while <meritqueen220.com>, <meritqueen221.com> and <meritqueen222.com> were all registered on October 8, 2025, with the same registrar (Spaceship, Inc.);
- the websites associated with the disputed domain names use the same overall “MERITQUEEN” branding (including the same logo) and are directed at the same Turkish-speaking gambling/betting audience;
- the websites cross-reference each other: in particular, the website at <meritqueen220.com> displays the contact email address “[.]@meritqueen.com” – i.e., an email address at the domain name <meritqueen.com>, which is registered in the name of the first-named Respondent – thereby directly linking the second-named Respondent's active website to the first-named the Respondent's domain name;
- the website at <meritqueen220.com> further announces an intended future migration of the same operation to <meritqueen221.com> and <meritqueen222.com>, demonstrating that the three Spaceship-registered domain names are operated as a coordinated sequence; and
- the disputed domain names were registered using privacy or redaction services, which is consistent with an attempt by the underlying operator to mask its identity.

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.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7).

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the complainant to show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1). In the present case, the Complainant has produced evidence of numerous registered trademarks consisting of, or incorporating, the element MERIT, in Türkiye, the European Union and at the international level, with priority dates significantly preceding the registration of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. Each of the disputed domain names reproduces the MERIT trademark in its entirety, followed by the additional term “queen” and, in three of them, by the numerical suffixes “220”, “221” and “222”, and the applicable gTLDs “.com” or “.net”.

It is well established by panels applying the Policy that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional terms may, however, bear on the assessment of the second and third elements ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8). Similarly, the applicable TLD in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, although the addition of the term “queen”, the numerical suffixes “220”, “221” and “222” may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s trademarks for the purposes of the Policy.

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 lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed 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 disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the trademark MERIT or to register or use the disputed domain names; the names of the underlying registrants disclosed by the Registrars bear no resemblance to the disputed domain names, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by any of the disputed domain names; nor is there any indication that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of any of the disputed domain names.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names <meritqueen.com>, <meritqueen.net> and <meritqueen220.com> have been used to host websites which offer, or redirect to, gambling and betting services under the "MERITQUEEN" sign, and which contain express representations that "MeritQueen is a Merit company" and that withdrawal transactions are "under the guarantee of Merit Hotel". These statements are objectively false since the Respondent is not, and has never been, part of the Complainant's corporate group, nor authorized to use the MERIT trademarks. The combination of the dominant element MERIT with the term "queen" and the use of the same figurative elements (including the cross design) associated with the Complainant's trademarks, makes clear that the Respondent's purpose is to suggest a commercial connection with the Complainant. Where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, panels have largely held that such a composition cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1). Moreover, UDRP panels do not consider bona fide offering of goods or services or a fair use if a respondent is hosting a website to provide products in direct competition with the Complainant (see, *Xiaomi, Inc. v. Eddie Zheng, Rc Technology Ltd; David Riverol, Rc Technology Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2403](#)).

As regards the disputed domain names <meritqueen221.com> and <meritqueen222.com>, the Respondent's own announcement on the website at <meritqueen220.com> makes clear that these domain names are intended to be used as successive future addresses for the same gambling/betting operation. Such intended use cannot give rise to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In addition, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1). In the circumstances of this case, the Panel considers that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant and to pass off its gambling/betting operation as that of, or as authorized by, the Complainant cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

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 Complainant's trademarks are reputed marks in the hospitality and gambling sectors and, in particular, with respect to Türkiye. The reputation and goodwill of the MERIT trademarks have been recognized by the Turkish IP Court (see *Merit Turizm Yatırım Ve İşletme Anonim Şirketi v. Fedlan Kilicaslan, G&F Company Group NV / Redsoft N.V*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1398](#)) and by previous UDRP panels (see, e.g., *Net Holding A.Ş., Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme A.Ş. v. Abdulgafur Karaer*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1954](#), where the Panel considered that a basic Internet search would have readily revealed the existence and commercial use of the MERIT brand, which is distinctive and strongly associated with the Complainant's hospitality and gaming services).

It has been established in previous UDRP decisions that the registration of a domain name incorporating a widely-recognized or well-known trademark by a third party with no connection to the trademark is a clear indication of bad faith (see *Pepsico, Inc. v. Domain Admin*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0435](#); *Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#)). In the present case, the Panel considers that the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names is established: (i) the underlying registrant of <meritqueen.com> and <meritqueen.net> is identified as a natural person resident in Türkiye, where the Complainants have their principal place of business and where the MERIT mark has been recognized as well-known; (ii) the disputed domain names are not merely composed of the dominant element MERIT, but combine it with the term "queen", a term plainly intended to evoke the "royal" component of the Complainant's prior MERIT ROYAL related rights; and (iii) the websites operated under the disputed domain names contain express statements identifying "MeritQueen" as "a Merit company" and referring to the Complainant's hotel and casino operations, which leaves no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and their trademarks specifically in mind when registering and using the disputed domain names.

The Panel considers that, as the disputed domain names <meritqueen.com>, <meritqueen.net> and <meritqueen220.com> are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and resolve to websites that make unauthorized use of those trademarks (including by reproducing figurative elements such as the cross design associated with the MERIT trademarks) while purporting to offer, or to redirect to platforms offering, gambling and betting services under the "MERITQUEEN" sign, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those websites and of the services offered thereon, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, the Panel considers that the express representations on the website at <meritqueen220.com> that "MeritQueen is a Merit company" and that withdrawal transactions are "under the guarantee of Merit Hotel", representations which are objectively false, are examples of passing off, and constitute bad faith use in their own right.

The Panel also notes a pattern of abusive registration. UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration. This may include a scenario where a respondent, on separate occasions, has registered trademark-abusive domain names, even where directed at the same brand owner; these separate registrations may be brought in a single case ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2). In the present case, Respondent has registered five trademark-abusive domain names targeting Complainant's trademarks, and has done so in two separate batches (two domain names in July 2024, followed by three further sequential domain names in October 2025). The announcement on the website at <meritqueen220.com> that the "current address is meritqueen221.com" and that the "next address will be meritqueen222.com" demonstrates that the registration of those domain names was intended to ensure the continuity of the infringing operation notwithstanding potential access restrictions, suspension, or enforcement measures.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1).

As regards the disputed domain names <meritqueen221.com> and <meritqueen222.com>, which do not appear to be actively used, the Panel has reviewed the available record and notes the reputation of the Complainants' trademarks, the composition of the disputed domain names, which consist of the dominant element of the Complainants' trademarks combined with the term "queen" and a numerical suffix, the Respondent's express statement of intent to use these domain names as successive future addresses for the "MERITQUEEN" gambling operation, the Respondent's use of a privacy service to mask its identity, and the Respondent's failure to submit any response in this proceeding. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the passive holding of <meritqueen221.com> and <meritqueen222.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith

under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

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 names <meritqueen.com>, <meritqueen.net>, <meritqueen220.com>, <meritqueen221.com> and <meritqueen222.com> be transferred to the Complainant Net Holding A.Ş.

/Zeynep Yasaman/

Zeynep Yasaman

Sole Panelist

Date: May 16, 2026