

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Net Holding A.Ş., and Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme A.Ş. v. Martin Longir,
Nowplatform Ltd., and Hakan Aruk
Case No. D2026-3269

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Net Holding A.Ş., and Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme A.Ş., Türkiye, represented by Sołtysiński Kawecki & Szlęzak, Poland.

The Respondents are Martin Longir, Nowplatform Ltd., Eswatini, and Hakan Aruk, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <meritwinapp.com>, <meritwin.com>, <meritwin395.com>, <meritwin396.com>, <meritwin397.com>, <meritwin398.com>, <meritwin399.com>, and <meritwin400.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain names <meritwingiris.com> and <meritwin.net> are registered with NameSilo, LLC.

NameCheap, Inc. and NameSilo, LLC are hereinafter referred to as the “Registrars”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 23, 2026. On July 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 24, and July 27, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses respectively disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / User #07bcbfba Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #7764b96a Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on July 27, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainants to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on July 30, 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 August 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on August 25, 2026. Due to an apparent issue with the notification, the Respondents were granted until September 1, 2026 to indicate whether they wished to participate to this proceeding. The Center did not receive any communication from the Respondents.

The Center appointed Tobias Malte Müller as the sole panelist in this matter on September 7, 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 Complainants' documented allegations which have remained undisputed that the Complainant, Net Holding A.Ş., is a Turkish company in the hospitality, casino, gaming and betting sectors, while the Complainant, Merit Turizm Yatırım ve İşletme A.Ş. ("Merit Turizm"), being one of its subsidiaries. The Complainants' activities can be found on their respective websites at "www.netholding.com" and "www.merithotels.com".

The Complainant, Merit Turizm, is the registered owner of several figurative trademarks consisting of or containing the verbal element "Merit" in particular in the following trademarks (the "MERIT Trademark(s)"):

- Turkish trademark No. 171909  , registered on June 16, 1997, for services in classes 39, 41, and 42;
- Turkish trademark No. 2013 106696  , registered on August 25, 2015, for goods and services in classes 28 and 35; and
- International trademark registration No. 1725494  , registered on December 23, 2022, for goods and services in classes 9, 41, and 42.

According to the Whois extracts before this Panel and the information provided by the Registrars, the relevant data for the disputed domain names are the following:

Disputed Domain Name	Registration Date	Registrant Name
<meritwin.com>	August 23, 2018	Martin Longir, Nowplatform Ltd.
<meritwin395.com>	December 3, 2025	Martin Longir
<meritwin396.com>	December 3, 2025	Martin Longir
<meritwin397.com>	December 3, 2025	Martin Longir
<meritwin398.com>	December 3, 2025	Martin Longir
<meritwin399.com>	December 3, 2025	Martin Longir

<meritwin400.com>	December 3, 2025	Martin Longir
<meritwin.net>	August 16, 2025	Hakan Aruk
<meritwingiris.com>	August 16, 2025	Hakan Aruk
<meritwinapp.com>	August 22, 2025	Hakan Aruk

The disputed domain names <meritwin.com>, <meritwin395.com>, <meritwin396.com>, <meritwin397.com>, <meritwin398.com>, and <meritwin399.com> redirect users to the website at <meritwin400.com> that allegedly offer online gambling/betting services. The disputed domain names <meritwin.net> and <meritwingiris.com> resolve to similar websites, providing information on login options and gambling/betting services and redirecting users to the website at <meritwin400.com> through buttons “GİRİŞ İÇİN TIKLAYINIZ!”, meaning “CLICK HERE TO ENTER” in English. The disputed domain name <meritwinapp.com> resolves to a website, providing instructions for installing an application to access gambling/betting services. These websites prominently display the verbal element “MERIT” in the Complainants’ trademarks, followed by the descriptive term “win” (i.e., “MERITWIN”), and combined with the figurative cross design featured in certain of the Complainants’ trademarks.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants contend that:

- (1) the Complainants are members of the same capital group and operate in a coordinated manner in pursuit of common economic interests. Both Complainants own registered trademarks containing the verbal element “MERIT”. As a result, the Complainants have a specific common grievance against the Respondents and are affected by the actions of the Respondents in a similar fashion. Therefore, it is equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation;
- (2) the disputed domain names are subject to common control, notwithstanding their formal registration in the names of two different registrants. In particular, the websites under the disputed domain names registered in the name of Martin Longir redirect users to websites accessible under the disputed domain names registered in the name of Hakan Aruk, thereby confirming the operational link between the two registrants. Accordingly, consolidation of this Complaint against multiple Respondents is fair and equitable to all parties; and
- (3) the operation of the websites available under the disputed domain names constitutes an unauthorized use of and a free-ride on the reputation of the MERIT Trademarks. These websites employ branding practically identical to that of the Complainants’ actual establishment (or redirect to websites employing such branding). It can therefore be assumed that the Respondents were aware of the MERIT Trademarks. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as the impersonation of the Complainants and the passing off constitutes bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainants’ contentions

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that a disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of disputed domain name; and
- (iii) disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

6.1 Procedural Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Complainants

The Complaint was filed by both Net Holding A.Ş., and Merit Turizm, related corporate entities.

As set forth in section 4.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)): “In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple unrelated complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation.”

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the two Complainants have a specific common grievance against the Respondents because they allege a corporate connection. In addition, they both own registered trademarks containing the verbal element “MERIT”.

Against this background, the Panel does not see reasons why a consolidated Complaint brought by the Complainants would not be fair and equitable. Moreover, the Respondents failed to come forward with any allegations or evidence to object to the consolidation. For reasons of procedural efficiency, fairness, and equity the Panel therefore accepts the joint Complaint.

Therefore, throughout the remainder of the current Decision, the Panel will refer to both the Complainants as “the Complainant”.

B. Consolidation: 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 Complaint 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 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As set forth in section 4.11.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#): "Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s)."

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following factors:

- (1) The disputed domain names reproduce a similar naming pattern, i.e., placing the verbal element of the MERIT Trademarks followed by the term "win". Eight of the 10 disputed domain names add further elements after the element "win", such as a three-digit figure or one of the terms "giris" or "app".
- (2) Some of the Respondents' contact details appear to be inaccurate, taking into account the contact details of the Respondent, Martin Longir, Nowplatform Ltd. contains a city name which is apparently a town in Switzerland, and a Swiss prefixed phone number but associated with the country name Eswatini.
- (3) The disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period, i.e., between August 16 and December 3, 2025, except for the disputed domain name <meritwin.com> which dates back to August 23, 2018.
- (4) The content and layout of the websites corresponding to the disputed domain names prominently display the verbal element "MERIT" in the Complainant's MERIT Trademarks, followed by the descriptive term "win" and combined with the figurative cross design featured in certain of the Complainant's trademarks.

On the balance of probabilities and taking into account the above circumstances of the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The Respondents have been given the opportunity to comment on the foregoing and have elected not to file a formal response. In particular, the Respondents failed to come forward with any specific allegations or evidence to object the consolidation.

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 Issues

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, namely several figurative trademarks consisting of or containing the verbal element “MERIT”, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel notes that said trademarks are stylized figurative marks, verbally dominated by the term “MERIT” and combined with the further verbal elements “international” or “poker” in clearly smaller letters or a design element. Panel assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) domain name and the textual components of the relevant marks. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10.

The Panel finds the dominating verbal element “MERIT” in the MERIT Trademarks is recognizable within the disputed domain names, where it appears at the beginning of the disputed domain names. Although the addition of other elements, here, “win” and/or “giris” (apparently meaning “login” or “sign in” in the Turkish language), “app”, or figures, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms and/or figures does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the MERIT Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the MERIT Trademarks 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 names:

As detailed above, the use of the disputed domain names can be categorized as: a) redirect users to the website at <meritwin400.com> that allegedly offer online gambling/betting services; or b) resolve to websites, providing information on login options and gambling/betting services; or c) resolve to a website, providing instructions for installing an application to access such gambling/ betting services. Furthermore, all of these websites prominently display, without the Complainant’s authorization, the verbal element “MERIT” in the Complainant’s trademarks, followed by the descriptive term “win” (i.e., “MERITWIN”), and combined with the figurative cross design featured in certain of the Complainant’s trademarks. The websites to which the disputed domain names resolve/redirect do not display any accurate and prominent disclaimer regarding the Respondent’s (non-existing) relationship with the Complainant.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names contain the term “Merit” which is the dominating element of the Complainant’s registered trademarks plus the addition of the term “win” which is inherently descriptive for the Complainant’s field of commerce. It is acknowledged amongst previous UDRP panels that certain additional terms within the trademark owner’s field of commerce may or may not by themselves trigger an inference of affiliation, and would normally require a further examination by the panel of the

broader facts and circumstances of the case – particularly including the associated website content – to assess potential respondent's rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. In the present case, some of the disputed domain names incorporate terms with an “inherent Internet connotation” – here “giris” (apparently meaning “login” or “sign in” in the Turkish language) and “app”, which are seen as tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. Overall, the Panel therefore finds that the composition and use of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant

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 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.

According to the Complainant's documented allegations, which remained undisputed, the disputed domain names resolve/redirect to active websites allegedly offering online gambling and/or betting services or providing information on login options and gambling/betting services, or providing instructions for installing an application to access such gambling and/or betting services, all using the sign “MERITWIN”.

These websites prominently display, without authorization by the Complainant, (i) the verbal element “MERIT”, which dominates the Complainant's trademarks, and (ii) the figurative cross design featured in certain of the Complainant's trademarks, to purportedly offer services competing online gambling/betting services. For the Panel it is therefore evident that the Respondent knew the Complainant's mark and business. Consequently, and in absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew that the disputed domain names included the Complainant's trademarks when it registered the disputed domain names, and by using the disputed domain names, it has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the MERIT Trademarks. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

In addition, this finding of bad faith registration and use is further supported by further circumstances resulting from the case at hand, which are the following:

- (i) the Respondent's failure to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use;
- (ii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent's failure to provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain names;
- (iii) the nature of the disputed domain names, incorporating the term “Merit” which is the dominant element of the Complainant's marks (with additional terms – such as the term “win” which is relevant to the Complainant's area of activity), while the oldest of these trademarks predate the disputed domain names' registration by more than two decades;
- (iv) the websites not containing any disclaimer as to the lack of relationship with the Complainant; and
- (v) the fact that the address data provided by the Respondent in the registration details of the disputed domain names does not appear to be accurate, as described above.

Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent tried to pass itself off as the Complainant which constitutes 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 <meritwinapp.com>, <meritwin.com>, <meritwingiris.com>, <meritwin.net>, <meritwin395.com>, <meritwin396.com>, <meritwin397.com>, <meritwin398.com>, <meritwin399.com>, and <meritwin400.com> be transferred to the Complainant Net Holding A.Ş.

/Tobias Malte Müller/

Tobias Malte Müller

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026