

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v.
carlos monte

Case No. D2026-3046

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 Respondent is carlos monte, Argentina.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <monte-carlo777.pro> and <montecarlo-777.pro> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 10, 2026. On July 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 14, 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 (Registration Private, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 14, 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 July 17, 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 July 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 limited liability company founded in 1863 by a Sovereign Decree passed by Prince Charles III of Monaco and has a monopoly for casino and gambling activities for the territory of the Principality of Monaco.

The Complainant has been operating, among others, the Casino de Monte-Carlo for more than 150 years which became one of the most famous gambling facilities in the world.

The Complainant is the owner of, among others, the MONTE CARLO trademark filed with the Monaco Trademark Office on December 31, 2013, and registered on February 12, 2014, under number 14.30170.

The disputed domain names were registered on September 12, 2025. The Complainant alleges that the homepages linked with both disputed domain names contain references to the Complainant and to the online gambling sector. The evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name <monte-carlo777.pro> resolved to a website of “Monte Carlo Online Casino” purportedly offering online gaming/gambling services.

At the time of the Decision the disputed domain names resolve to inactive webpages.

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 which incorporate the entirety of its MONTE CARLO trademark with the addition of the term “777” (referencing the field of gambling) is confusingly similar to the trademark which acquired significant reputation;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it is unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy; and
- given the strong reputation of the Complainant’s trademark which the disputed domain names fully incorporate and their use in relation to gambling and gaming services for which the Complainant is widely known it is impossible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark and registered the disputed domain names for any other reason than to unduly benefit from the prestige of the Complainant and its trademark without authorization.

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

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Matter - Multiple Domain Names

The Complaint was filed in relation to two disputed domain names registered by the same domain name registrant.

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. Due to the fact that the disputed domain names have been registered by the Respondent the Panel finds that this requirement is fulfilled.

6.2 Substantive Matters – Three Elements

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 names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the domain names have been registered and are 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 names. 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 Complainant's trademark is reproduced and recognizable in the disputed domain names. Although the addition of other terms, here "777" and the presence of a hyphen between the terms composing the disputed domain names may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such a terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark 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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent to use its trademark in the disputed domain names or in any other way.

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.

Even though the Panel notes that the Respondent's name comprises the term "monte", which could potentially give rise to a claim of legitimate interests – which, however, has not been asserted by the Respondent –, as mentioned above, the Complainant has been operating its Casino de Monte-Carlo business for over 150 years, having gained notoriety for its MONTE CARLO trademark for gambling services. The disputed domain name <monte-carlo777.pro> resolved to a website of "Monte Carlo Online Casino" offering online gaming/gambling services, which is the same industry and business the Complainant has been famous for. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct points towards targeting of the Complainant, and, as such, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate or fair use and cannot confer any rights of legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent.

Also, in these circumstances, passive holding of the disputed domain name <montecarlo-777.pro> in itself does not establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and 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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names feature the Complainant's trademark that was used and registered long before the Respondent acquired the disputed domain names.

The Panel also notes that UDRP panels have found that the MONTE CARLO trademark is a well-known brand directly associated with the Complainant's gambling and gaming business. See e.g., *Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v. Qian Ling lu5289*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2152](#).

The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or in this case confusingly similar to a well-known trademark can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Respondent defaulted and thus failed to provide any explanation for its inclusion of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain names along with the number "777" that is commonly associated with the

gambling and casino industry which are the activities the Complainant has been famous for. In absence of any such explanation and based on the above facts and circumstances, the Panel infers on balance that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark and registered the disputed domain names to target the Complainant.

Currently, there is no evidence that the disputed domain names are being used in any active way. However, from the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

In view of the Panel, in the totality of the circumstances, them being the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark in the gambling and gaming industry and business, the composition of the disputed domain names as mentioned a above, the Respondent’s lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and the Respondent’s failure to submit a response and provide any evidence of actual of contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain names supports a finding of 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 <monte-carlo777.pro> and <montecarlo-777.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: August 24, 2026