

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Net Holding A.Ş., and Merit Turizm Yatirim ve İşletme A.Ş. v. Jhon Deph; Ivanova Nv; Gene M Bleich; Liman / Nima Company; Liman / Nima Company; Meritliman; Hatrak Hatrak, Hatcom; Cihangir Ulu, Ulu Company Ukraine; and Reny Rustem  
Case No. D2026-1824

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainants are Net Holding A.Ş., Türkiye, and Merit Turizm Yatirim ve İşletme A.Ş., Türkiye, represented by Softysiński Kawecki & Szlęzak, Poland.

The Respondents are jhon Deph, Netherlands (Kingdom of the); Ivanova Nv, the Russian Federation; Gene M Bleich, United States of America; Liman / Nima Company, France; Liman / Nima Company, Cyprus; Meritliman, Cyprus; Hatrak Hatrak, Hatcom, Türkiye; Cihangir Ulu, Ulu Company Ukraine, Ukraine; and Reny Rustem, United Kingdom.

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

The disputed domain names <meritlimancasino.co>, <meritlimancasino.com>, <meritlimancasino.online>, <meritlimancasino204.vip>, and <meritlimancasino237.app> are registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com.

The disputed domain names <meritliman-casino.com>, <meritlimancasinogiris.com>, and <meritlimangiris.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain names <meritlimancasino.me> and <meritlimancasino.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC.

The disputed domain names <meritlimancasino379.com>, <meritlimancasino380.com>, <meritlimancasino381.com>, <meritlimancasino382.com>, <meritlimancasino383.com>, <meritlimancasino384.com>, <meritlimancasino385.com>, <meritlimancasino386.com>, <meritlimancasino387.com>, <meritlimancasino388.com>, <meritlimancasino389.com>, <meritlimancasino390.com>, <meritlimancasino391.com>, <meritlimancasino392.com>, and <meritlimancasino393.com> are registered with Realtime Register B.V.

The disputed domain name <meritlimancasino394.com> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited.

The disputed domain name <meritlimancasino907.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (together the “Registrars”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 28, 2026. On April 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 29 and 30, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (The RDAP server redacted the value; User #aa574447 Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org; The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf; Please query the RDDS service; Privacy User #3123f070, PrivacyGuardian.org llc; REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, n/a) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on May 5, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainants 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 Complainants filed an amended Complaint on May 8, 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 May 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on June 9, 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 in this administrative proceeding are NET Holding A.Ş (“Net Holding”) and Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme A.Ş. (“Merit Turizm”), joint stock companies organized and existing under the laws of Türkiye.

Net Holding is one of the leading Turkish companies in the hospitality, casino, gaming, and betting sectors, with Merit Turizm being one of its subsidiaries.

Merit Turizm owns a number of trademarks consisting of the term “Merit”, including the Turkish Trademark Registration No. 2018 79801 for the figurative mark MERIT ROYAL PREMIUM HOTEL & CASINO & SPA registered on December 27, 2018, and International Trademark Registration No. 1725494 for the figurative mark MERIT registered on December 23, 2022.

Net Holding is the owner of the European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 016172389 for the figurative mark MERIT ROYAL HOTEL&CASINO&SPA registered since May 24, 2017.

The Complainants are owners and operators of the “Liman Hotel & Casino by Merit” in Kyrenia, Cyprus.

The disputed domain names were registered between October 3, 2020 and May 27, 2026.

According to the Complainants:

the disputed domain name <meritlimancasino204.vip> resolved to a website offering “VIP” cards in connection with the Respondent’s “Merit Liman Casino” gambling/betting services. The cards featured the exact design element which the Complainants have been using at their “Liman Hotel & Casino by Merit”;

the disputed domain names <meritlimancasino.co>, <meritliman-casino.com>, <meritlimancasinogiris.com>, <meritlimancasino.me>, <meritlimancasinoo.com>, <meritlimancasino.online>, <meritlimancasino907.com>, and <meritlimangiris.com> resolved to Turkish language websites with content related to casino, gambling, and betting under “Merit Liman Casino” name, providing login options;

the disputed domain name <meritlimancasino237.app> resolved to a website providing instructions and a link to download the mobile app for “Merit Liman Casino”;

the disputed domain names <meritlimancasino.com>, <meritlimancasino379.com>, <meritlimancasino380.com>, <meritlimancasino381.com>, <meritlimancasino382.com>, <meritlimancasino383.com>, and <meritlimancasino384.com> resolved or redirected to a website in Turkish language offering “Merit Liman Casino” casino, gambling, and betting services; and

the disputed domain names <meritlimancasino385.com>, <meritlimancasino386.com>, <meritlimancasino387.com>, <meritlimancasino388.com>, <meritlimancasino389.com>, <meritlimancasino390.com>, <meritlimancasino391.com>, <meritlimancasino392.com>, <meritlimancasino393.com>, and <meritlimancasino394.com> have not resolved to active websites.

## **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 the Complainants’ marks since they fully incorporate the term “MERIT” which is the dominant element of their marks;
- the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since they are unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy;
- given the reputation of the Complainants’ marks and the Respondents’ use of the disputed domain names the Respondents must have been aware of the marks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names;
- the Respondents have registered the disputed domain names to confuse consumers as to the source of origin of the corresponding websites and freeride on the reputation of the Complainants’ marks; and

- most of the Respondents' registration data appears to be either fictitious or incomplete, which is further indicative of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainants request that the disputed domain names be transferred from the Respondents to the Complainant Net Holding A.Ş.

## **B. Respondents**

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural Issues**

#### **Location of one of the Respondents**

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of one of the Respondents disclosed by the Registrar, the registrant of the disputed domain name <meritlimangiris.com> appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name <meritlimangiris.com> was registered on May 15, 2024 that is during the above-referenced international conflict. The Panel has no doubts – for the reasons set out later in this Decision – that the Respondent registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. These facts and circumstances suggest that the Respondent maintained access to the Internet and had control over the disputed domain name <meritlimangiris.com>.

The Panel also notes that everything required was done to notify the Respondent, with documents and communications sent to the Respondent's physical address in Ukraine and to its email address as registered with the Registrar, as specified by the Rules. Noting the Respondent's name is a common Turkish name and the composition of the disputed domain name incorporates Turkish words, the Panel finds it likely that the registrant details are fake.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case the Panel concludes that the registrant of the disputed domain name <meritlimangiris.com> who is allegedly located in Ukraine has been given a fair opportunity to present its case and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with the due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

#### **Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to 27 domain names registered by nine different domain name registrants. The Complainants allege that the disputed domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainants request 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 Complainants' 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 Complainants' 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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards to common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names all target the Complainants and their marks and that the structure of the disputed domain names is identical or highly similar (with the exception of the disputed domain name <meritlimangiris.com>, the disputed domain names follow the same pattern: MERIT mark, plus "liman", plus "casino" -or "casinoo"- which is directly referring to the Complainants' service, with the addition of various numbers or the term "giris" meaning "login" in Turkish). 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.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element; it is the textual element "MERIT" to be assessed. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10.

The MERIT mark is fully incorporated into and evidently recognizable in all disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants' marks for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of other terms, here "liman" (the name of one of the Complainants' casino hotels), "casino" or "casinoo", "giris" (in this context meaning "login" in Turkish), and various three-digit numbers may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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 that the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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 Complainants did not license or otherwise agree for registration and use of their prior registered marks by the Respondent.

The use of a number of the disputed domain names to resolve to websites that feature the Complainants' MERIT mark and the term "Liman", which is the name of one of their casino hotels, in connection with promoting services identical to or similar with those provided by the Complainants is not legitimate since it is misleading as to the source or sponsorship and a pretext for commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3.

The passive holding of the other disputed domain names does not amount to use or preparations to use them in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Panel finds that 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 Complainants' marks predate the registration of the disputed domain names which incorporate the MERIT mark and "MERIT" element of the other marks. This fact, coupled with the use of a number of the disputed domain names as mentioned above indicates that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainants' marks at the time of registration. In this case, most of the disputed domain names resolved to websites that featured the MERIT mark for purported casino services, and all the disputed domain names include the term "liman" which is the name of one of the Complainants' casino hotels and the term "casino", except <meritlimangiris.com>, which is directly referring to the Complainants' services. As regards the disputed domain names that resolved to the mentioned websites, such use by the Respondent to intentionally attract Internet users to its website by creating confusion with the Complainants' mark as to the source of the websites and its services for commercial gain is evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

As regards the disputed domain names that have not resolved to active websites, or currently do not resolve to an active website, such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

In this case the Panel notes (i) the distinctiveness of the Complainants' marks; (ii) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; and (iii) the Respondent's use of fictitious or incomplete contact details at registration of a number of the disputed domain names which would be in breach of its registration agreements are further indications supporting the Panel's finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

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 <meritlimancasino.co>, <meritliman-casino.com>, <meritlimancasino.com>, <meritlimancasinogiris.com>, <meritlimancasino.me>, <meritlimancasino.com>, <meritlimancasino.online>, <meritlimancasino204.vip>, <meritlimancasino237.app>, <meritlimancasino379.com>, <meritlimancasino380.com>, <meritlimancasino381.com>, <meritlimancasino382.com>, <meritlimancasino383.com>, <meritlimancasino384.com>, <meritlimancasino385.com>, <meritlimancasino386.com>, <meritlimancasino387.com>, <meritlimancasino388.com>, <meritlimancasino389.com>, <meritlimancasino390.com>, <meritlimancasino391.com>, <meritlimancasino392.com>, <meritlimancasino393.com>, <meritlimancasino394.com>, <meritlimancasino907.com>, and <meritlimangiris.com> be transferred to the Complainant Net Holding A.Ş.

*/Zoltán Takács/*

**Zoltán Takács**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2026