

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Centro de Promociones Los Cabos San Lucas, S.A. De C.V. v.
Stefanos Syminelakis
Case No. D2026-2460

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Centro de Promociones Los Cabos San Lucas, S.A. De C.V., Mexico, represented by Vila Abogados / Attorneys at Law, Mexico.

The Respondent is STEFANOS SYMINELAKIS, Greece.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <solmar.app> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 5, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 9, 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 June 9, 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 amended Complaint on June 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on June 14, 2026 and July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is a company engaged in the provision of hotel and tourism services in Cabo San Lucas, Baja California Sur, Mexico. It operates a collection of resort properties located in this destination, offering accommodation, dining, recreational activities, and vacation experiences directed at both domestic and international visitors. The Complainant's history dates back to 1974, with more than fifty years of continuous operation in the hospitality industry.

The Complainant is registered owner of many trademark registrations containing the term "solmar", e.g. Mexican trademark registration No. 1149459 SOLMAR filed on November 20, 2009 and registered on March 19, 2010 for services in class 43; United States of America trademark registration 6,004,850 registered on March 10, 2020 for services in class 43.

It also uses the domain name <solmar.com> for its official website.

The disputed domain name <solmar.app> was registered on June 26, 2024. Furthermore, the evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name was offered for sale, at USD 1,975.00 through the domain marketplace GoDaddy and at USD 1,950.00 through the service provider Sav.com.

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since it wholly incorporates the distinctive term "solmar" which constitutes the dominant element of the Complainant's trademarks.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, it has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the SOLMAR mark or register any domain name incorporating it. There is no relationship between the parties that would give rise to any such rights. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name "solmar"; and is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name. On the contrary, the disputed domain name was offered for sale at USD 1,950.00 and USD 1,975.00, vastly exceeding registration costs, which evidences the absence of any bona fide use and indicates that the Respondent registered the domain name solely to obtain an undue commercial advantage.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, given the longstanding and widespread use of the SOLMAR mark, the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name. The registration of a domain name that is identical to a well-known trademark, combined with its offering for sale at a price vastly exceeding registration costs, constitutes bad faith registration and use. A basic search for the term "solmar" would have immediately revealed the Complainant's well-established trademark rights and its business in the hospitality sector. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website offering goods or services, but instead (at the time of filing) resolved to a domain listing page on which it was offered for sale at USD 1,975.00 and USD 1,950.00, a price vastly exceeding registration costs, which is indicative of bad faith registration and use. Furthermore,

the Respondent has expressly consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant by communication addressed to the Center.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions by filing a formal Response, but sent two email communications indicating a consent to transfer the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

As mentioned above, the Respondent did not file a formal Response. However, he sent two communications to the Center indicating willingness to settle the dispute and transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The first one on June 14, 2026 stating amongst others that "I confirm that I do not wish to contest the Complaint and I hereby consent to the transfer of the domain name solmar.app to the Complainant. This consent is provided solely for the purpose of resolving this proceeding efficiently and should not be construed as an admission of any allegation contained in the Complaint." and the second one on July 13, 2026 stating amongst others that "As I stated in my previous email, I do not wish to contest the Complaint and I consent to the transfer of the domain name solmar.app to the Complainant."

Where parties to a UDRP proceeding have not been able to settle their dispute prior to the issuance of a panel decision using the standard settlement process, but the respondent has nevertheless given its consent on the record to the transfer remedy sought by the complainant, panels may order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.10.

Noting the Respondent's clear and unambiguous consent, and the absence of egregious bad faith circumstance warranting a decision on the merits, the Panel finds it appropriate to order the requested remedy solely on the basis of the Respondent's consent.

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 <solmar.app> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2026