

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alcora Corp v. Michael, Global
Case No. D2026-2305

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alcora Corp, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, P.C., United States.

The Respondent is Michael, Global, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <monavestlimited.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 28, 2026. On May 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 29, 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 (Realtime Register B.V.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 2, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 2, 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 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 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 an international beauty corporation formed in 2001.

The Complainant's subsidiary Monat Global Corp. is a multi-level marketing company which sells haircare, skincare and wellness products since 2014, with "Monat" being one of its brands. Monat Global Corp. sells its products through social media advertisements and through its website "www.monatglobal.com".

The Complainant portfolio of trademarks include:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 5476080 MONAT, registered on May 22, 2018; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7104724 MONATIONS UNITED registered on July 11, 2023.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 19, 2026, and has been resolving to a website purporting to be an automatic online investment platform focusing mainly on crypto currency trading. However, one of the sections of the website titled "Monat MLM Passive Rewards Scheme" makes extensive use of the Complainant's MONAT and MONATIONS UNITED marks, inclusive of videos from the Complainant's official Instagram account and its 2025 MONATIONS UNITED Annual Convention.

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, which incorporates the majority of its MONAT mark with the addition of descriptive terms is confusingly similar to the MONAT mark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it is unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy;
- When one user engaged with the chatbox to ask if the website was associated with MONAT Global, the response was "Yes we are working in conjunction with Monat hair products! A lot of Monat users participate highly on our community."
- the use of the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark at registration and is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark; and
- the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name provides false contact information.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the complaint, namely that:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the 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. 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 Panel finds that the Complainant's MONAT mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The content of the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name as mentioned above, namely extensive use of the Complainant's MONAT and MONATIONS UNITED marks further supports a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's MONAT mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.15.

Although the addition of other terms here, "vest" and "limited" 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 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 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 Complainant has established that it has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent to use its MONAT mark in the disputed domain name or in any other way.

As mentioned above, the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to resolve to its website which purports to be an online investment platform focusing mainly on crypto currency trading. However, the extensive use of the Complainant's MONAT and MONATIONS UNITED marks, inclusive of videos from the Complainant's official Instagram account and its 2025 MONATIONS UNITED Annual Convention on the website at the disputed domain name does not support the purpose claimed by the Respondent on its website. In view of the Panel, it is merely a pretext designed to camouflage the Respondent's real intent behind registration and use of the disputed domain name, in this case to target the Complainant and its mark through false suggestion of affiliation which does not constitute a legitimate fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3.

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 registration of the disputed domain name occurred long after the Complainant's registration and use of the mark.

Taking into account the Panel's findings under section 6.B of this Decision with regard to the absence of the Respondent's own rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; the content of the website to which the disputed domain name points as mentioned above and the Respondent's failure to submit a response; the Panel is of the view that the disputed domain name was initially registered with actual knowledge of the Complainant's business and MONAT mark and then subsequently used to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its MONAT mark.

In the absence of any response by the Respondent, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the contact information on the Respondent's website is false, which is further indicative of bad faith.

The above facts and circumstances in view of the Panel support an inference of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and [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 name <monavestlimited.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: July 13, 2026