

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v.
Abbondanzio Marchesi and John Dean
Case No. D2026-2995

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco, Monaco, represented by De Gaulle Fleurance & Associés, France.

The Respondents are Abbondanzio Marchesi, Italy, and John Dean, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <casino-monaco.online>, <casinomonacoportugal.com>, <casinomonacoslovakia.com>, <casinomonacosuisse.com>, <casinomontecarloargentina.online>, <casinomontecarlocroatia.com>, <casinomontecarlospain.com>, <monacocasinohungary.com>, <montecarlocasinohungary.com> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 8, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 9, 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) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 12, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with a different underlying registrant 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 July 16, 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 July 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 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 a company organized under the laws of Monaco and operating under the name Monte-Carlo Société des Bains de Mer. It was founded on April 6, 1863. The Complainant operates the Casino de Monte-Carlo and another casino and gaming room in Monaco, as well as an integrated resort comprising two palaces and two hotels, restaurants and bars, spas, sports clubs, and cultural and leisure venues. The evidence submitted by the Complainant describes the Casino de Monte-Carlo and its resort as having an international reputation in the luxury hospitality and gambling sectors.

The Complainant owns a trademark portfolio for the marks CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO and CASINO DE MONACO, including but not limited to the following Monegasque trademark registrations: the CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO trademark, registered in Monaco under No. 96.17407, with registration date October 30, 1996 and the CASINO DE MONACO trademark, registered in Monaco under No. 02.23234, with registration date September 30, 2002. The Panel notes that the Complainant’s CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO and CASINO DE MONACO trademarks have previously been recognized by panels applying the Policy as well-known brands in connection with gaming, casino, and related services, see for instance *Société des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v. Universal Spheres Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0822](#).

The disputed domain names were all registered between November 6, 2025 and February 3, 2026. The evidence shows that the disputed domain names were and remain used for casino-themed gambling promotion websites having substantially similar look-and-feel, structure and features. The websites appear to be configured as national-language versions directed to the respective countries identified in the disputed domain names, including Argentina, Spain, Switzerland, Portugal, Slovakia, Hungary, and Croatia. Each website includes references to either “Casino Monaco” or “Casino Monte Carlo”, together with gambling-related content, including categories of casino games and features inviting users to register or log in. Eight of the nine websites also display a picture of the Complainant’s casino, and several of the websites contain express references to the Complainant’s casino in connection with the relevant national market.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO and CASINO DE MONACO trademarks, as they reproduce the principal elements of those marks, with only the omission of the term “de”, the addition of geographic terms, or an inversion of the constituent elements. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain names are designed as national-market versions directed to the countries identified in the domain names and that the Complainant’s casino is commonly referred to as both Casino de Monte-Carlo and Casino de Monaco.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. In particular, the Complainant states that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondents to use its trademarks or to register domain names incorporating them, and that there is no affiliation or other relationship between the Parties. The Complainant further relies on its trademark searches concerning the disclosed registrants and submits that the Respondents are not known by the disputed domain names and have not made any bona fide or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of them. Rather, the disputed domain names resolve to gambling websites that use the Complainant’s marks and imagery in a manner intended to create an association with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It relies on the longstanding reputation of its CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO and CASINO DE MONACO trademarks and on prior UDRP decisions recognizing the reputation of those marks. The Complainant further contends that the Respondents deliberately selected domain names combining “casino” with “Monaco” or “Monte-Carlo” and geographic terms, and used them for substantially similar gambling websites, including websites displaying a picture of the Complainant’s casino and referring to “Casino Monaco” or “Casino Monte-Carlo”. The Complainant submits that this conduct was intended to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: 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 disputes 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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.11.2.

The Panel has carefully reviewed all elements of this case, giving particular weight to the following elements and facts: (a) the disputed domain names all incorporate the Complainant’s CASINO DE MONACO and/or CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO trademarks, or their dominant elements, in combination in

several instances with geographic terms corresponding to Argentina, Spain, Switzerland, Portugal, Slovakia, Hungary, or Croatia, thereby exposing a pattern; (b) the disputed domain names were registered over a relatively short period, between November 6, 2025 and February 3, 2026, all with the same Registrar; (c) the disputed domain names all resolve to active casino-themed gambling promotion websites having substantially similar look-and-feel, structure and features, including similar page layouts, login and registration features, and references to “Casino Monaco” or “Casino MonteCarlo”, with eight of the nine websites displaying a picture of the Complainant’s casino; (d) the websites promote substantially similar gambling services, including various categories of casino games, discuss the Complainant’s gambling offering and appear to be configured as versions directed to the respective national markets as identified in the disputed domain names; and (e) although the Respondents were duly notified of the proceedings and given an opportunity to respond, including in relation to the Complainant’s request for consolidation, neither Respondent submitted a Response or otherwise objected to the consolidation of the disputes.

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.

6.2. Substantive Matters

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 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 Complainant’s CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO and CASINO DE MONACO marks are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of geographical terms, including “argentina”, “spain”, “suisse”, “portugal”, “slovakia”, “hungary”, and “croatia”, 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 marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. In addition, the omission of the term “de”, the use of a hyphen, and the inversion of the constituent elements in disputed domain names <montecarlocasinohungary.com> and <monacocasinohungary.com> do not alter this assessment.

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 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 Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO or CASINO DE MONACO trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating those trademarks. Further, there is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant in any way, or that it has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Panel also finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, based on the evidence, the disputed domain names were and are being used for gambling promotion websites displaying references to "Casino Monaco" or "Casino MonteCarlo", with eight of the nine websites displaying a picture of the Complainant's casino, together with various categories of casino games and features inviting Internet users to log in or register, in a manner that falsely suggested an association or affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain names, combining, in most instances, the Complainant's well-known CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO or CASINO DE MONACO trademarks (incorporated nearly in their entirety) with geographical terms, including "argentina", "spain", "suisse", "portugal", "slovakia", "hungary", and "croatia", coupled with the use of the disputed domain names, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites.

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 finds that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO and CASINO DE MONACO trademarks. These trademarks had been registered and used for many years before the registration of the disputed domain names, and the evidence indicates that they enjoy a strong international reputation in the field of casino and gambling services. The Panel also notes that these marks have previously been recognized as well known, including in *Société des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v. Universal Spheres Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0822](#), and the Panel agrees with that assessment. These circumstances support an inference of bad faith registration, further reinforced by the Respondent's subsequent use of the disputed domain names for substantially similar gambling promotion websites referring to "Casino Monaco" or "Casino Monte Carlo", with eight of the nine websites also displaying a picture of the Complainant's casino, together with various casino games and features inviting Internet users to register or log in. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted its trademarks when registering the disputed domain names.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CASINO DE MONTE-CARLO and CASINO DE MONACO trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the gambling services offered on them. The websites refer to "Casino Monaco" or "Casino Monte-Carlo", and eight of the nine display a picture of the Complainant's casino and are used to promote casino games, discuss the Complainant's gambling offering and related features, together with the links inviting users to register or log in. In the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and constitutes evidence of use in bad faith.

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 <casino-monaco.online>, <casinomonacoportugal.com>, <casinomonacoslovakia.com>, <casinomonacosuisse.com>, <casinomontecarloargentina.online>, <casinomontecarlocroatia.com>, <casinomontecarlospain.com>, <monacocasinohungary.com> and <montecarlocasinohungary.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: September 3, 2026