

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Perfetti Van Melle Benelux B.V. v. hakan mavzer
Case No. D2026-2260

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Perfetti Van Melle Benelux B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is hakan mavzer, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mentos.uno> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 26, 2026. On May 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 27, 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 (Not Disclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 29, 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 May 29, 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 June 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on June 26, 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 one of the world's leading manufacturers in the candy and confectionery sector. The Complainant was formed in 2001 with the merger of the Italian-based company Perfetti S.p.A. and the Dutch-based company Van Melle NV.

The Complainant has been using the mark MENTOS in commerce since the 1930s in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) and in the 1970s in the United States of America ("United States") in particular in connection with confectionary, candies and chewing gum.

The Complainant owns several marks for MENTOS (word or device) including the following:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 013794185 for MENTOS (figurative mark), filed on March 4, 2015, and registered on July 8, 2015, in classes 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, and 24;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000117036 for MENTOS (word mark), filed on April 1, 1996, and registered on June 22, 1998, in class 30;
- International Trademark Registration No. 598995 for MENTOS (figurative mark), registered on March 2, 1993, in classes 5 and 30, designating amongst others Türkiye;
- International Trademark Registration No. 594722 for MENTOS (figurative mark), registered on November 26, 1992, in classes 5 and 30;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1374758 for MENTOS (word mark), registered on September 21, 2017, in class 30, designating amongst others Türkiye; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7134437 for MENTOS (figurative mark), filed on December 23, 2021, and registered on August 8, 2023, in class 5.

The Complainant also has online presence in Türkiye, in particular via its website "mentos.com.tr."

The disputed domain name was registered on September 3, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website hosting adult content bearing the heading "Istanbul Escort Bayanlar," as evidenced by the screenshots annexed to the Complaint. On September 12, 2025, the Complainant transmitted a formal cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via electronic mail, demanding the immediate cessation of all use of the disputed domain name and blocking access to the above-referenced web site. In response dated September 16, 2025, the Respondent explicitly rejected the Complainant's demand and instead tendered a counteroffer requiring payment of USD 500 as consideration for the domain name's transfer.

Following receipt of the Complainant's correspondence, the disputed domain name was redirected to "www.uncle.cfd", which hosted materially identical content to that previously published under the disputed domain name. Subsequently, the Respondent redirected the disputed domain name again to "www.cowsofcash.com", to which it currently redirects. Both websites promote escort services in Istanbul and according to the Complaint are geographically restricted to users accessing from Turkish territory.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions in the present proceedings but replied to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, as noted above.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name MENTOS, nor has it been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use its famous trademark.

Furthermore, using a domain name that mirrors a well-known brand to redirect users to a website displaying adult content does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. On the contrary, such unauthorized use constitutes an attempt to commercially benefit from the reputation of the Complainant's mark, which fails to confer any rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

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 MENTOS mark is well known as explicitly established in previous UDRP cases. See *Perfetti Van Melle Benelux BV v. Prasanth Mohanachandran*, WIPO Case No. [DTV2010-0013](#).
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2025, several decades after the Complainant had used the MENTOS mark in commerce, including in Türkiye, where the Respondent is reportedly located.
- The disputed domain name redirects (and resolved) to a website containing adult content.

Based on these facts, and in the absence of a response, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith by incorporating the MENTOS trademark to redirect users to adult content websites and subsequently offering to sell it to the Complainant for USD 500, an amount most likely exceeding out-of-pocket costs which point to bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy and section 3.1.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

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 name <mentos.uno> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: July 1, 2026