

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MGM Resorts International v. David Bonner
Case No. DIE2026-0003

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MGM Resorts International, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom (or “UK”).

The Registrant is David Bonner, Ireland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <betmgm.ie> is registered with IE Domain Registry Limited (“IEDR”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 26, 2026, via email. On March 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to IEDR a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 2026, IEDR transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Registrant (redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 27, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by IEDR, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 31, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IE Dispute Resolution Policy (the “IEDR Policy”), the WIPO Dispute Resolution Rules of Procedure for .IE Domain Name Registrations (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2.1 and 4.1, the Center formally notified the Registrant of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on April 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5.1, the due date for Response was May 18, 2026. The Registrant did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Registrant’s default on May 19, 2026.

The Center appointed TJ McIntyre as the sole panelist in this matter on May 28, 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 prominent United States gaming and entertainment company headquartered in Las Vegas, Nevada, which operates over thirty hotels and casinos worldwide. Since 2018 it has operated the BetMGM online gaming, casino and sports betting digital platform. This is offered both online and within the Complainant's network of casinos in the United States. In 2023, the Complainant expanded its BetMGM operations to the United Kingdom (UK), and in 2024 to Sweden and the Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Complainant holds registered trademarks related to its MGM and BETMGM brands across multiple jurisdictions, including:

Number	Mark	Jurisdiction	Registration Date	Class(es)
1060489	MGM	United States of America (USPTO)	March 1, 1977	41, 42
10355691	MGM	European Union (EUIPO)	July 14, 2017	35, 41, 43
6025462	BETMGM	United States of America (USPTO)	March 31, 2020	9, 41
18390081	BETMGM	European Union (EUIPO)	June 26, 2021	9, 41
UK00003590035	BETMGM	United Kingdom (IPO)	July 9, 2021	9, 41
UK00003974797	BETMGM (fig.)	United Kingdom (IPO)	March 1, 2024	9, 41

The disputed domain name <betmgm.ie> was registered on February 5, 2026. At the time of filing, the disputed domain name resolved to a betting and casino gaming website operating under the branding of "BetMGM" and "BetMGM Casino". The website referred to the Complainant's rewards program ("BetMGM Rewards") and displayed the Complainant's UK Gambling Commission account license number (GB 39198). Users attempting to log in, register, or click on casino game icons were redirected to third-party casino networks via affiliate links. The website does not contain any disclaimers regarding its relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorised the Registrant to register the disputed domain name or to provide the website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name on the following grounds:

Identical or confusingly similar: The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's protected identifier BETMGM because it incorporates the trademark in its entirety, only adding the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") (".ie"). It is also confusingly similar to the MGM trademark, as the descriptive addition of the term "bet" directly aligns with the Complainant's core area of commercial casino activity.

Rights or legitimate interests: The Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Registrant is not an authorised licensee, has no related trademark protections, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and uses the platform purely to deceptively redirect the Complainant's consumer traffic to third-party platforms.

Bad faith: The Registrant registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Registrant had actual knowledge of the Complainant's marks. Deceptively copying the Complainant's loyalty programs and license credentials to attract web users for commercial click-through gain constitutes bad faith exploitation under the IEDR Policy.

B. Registrant

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a protected identifier in which the Complainant has rights

Under paragraph 1.3.1 of the IEDR Policy, "protected identifiers" include "trade and service marks protected in the island of Ireland". The Complainant holds a European Union trademark and United Kingdom trademark for BETMGM in Classes 9 and 41 and has therefore established ownership of a protected identifier in Ireland.

The BETMGM mark is reproduced in its entirety within the disputed domain name which has no other element other than the ccTLD ".ie". Prior decisions under the IEDR Policy have confirmed that the addition of the ccTLD can generally be disregarded for the purpose of comparison of the mark with the disputed domain name (see e.g. *KROSS S.A. v. Cb Bicycle Distribution Limited*, WIPO Case No. DIE2025-0002). Consequently, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant's BETMGM mark and has satisfied the first element of the IEDR Policy.

It is not necessary for the purposes of this Decision to consider also the MGM marks or the figurative BETMGM mark.

B. Rights in Law or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant bears the burden of proof of establishing that the Registrant lacks any rights in law or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Regarding the burden of proof and given the similarities between the IEDR Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel relies, where relevant to this proceeding, by analogy on section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), which provides that:

"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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element."

The Complainant submits that the following elements establish a *prima facie* case that the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name:

- It has not authorised the Registrant to use the MGM or BETMGM marks.
- It has found no evidence that the Registrant is known as MGM or BETMGM nor that the Registrant has traded legitimately under those names.
- Given the fame of the Complainant's marks, there is no conceivable use to which the disputed domain name could be put now, or in the future, that would confer any legitimate interest upon the Registrant.
- The disputed domain name does not have any element of fair use and necessarily carries a high risk of implied affiliation.
- The Registrant has made deceptive use of the disputed domain name and the associated website by explicitly portraying it as affiliated with MGM.
- The Registrant has profited from this deception by redirecting traffic to competitors of the Complainant via affiliate links.

- The Registrant cannot rely on any use of the disputed domain name for email as establishing a legitimate interest as any such email would be highly confusing or misleading for the Complainant's employees, business partners, customers, and other stakeholders.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's arguments and finds that it has established a *prima facie* case that the Registrant has no rights in law or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As such, the burden of production shifts to the Registrant to rebut the Complainant's *prima facie* case. The Registrant has failed to respond to this proceeding and the evidence considered does not raise any possible issue of legitimate rights under paragraphs 3.1.1, 3.1.2 or 3.1.3 of the IEDR Policy. The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the second element of the policy.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 1.1.3 of the IEDR Policy the Complainant must demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered or used in bad faith. In this case the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark and the associated website includes references to the Complainant's "BetMGM Rewards" loyalty framework and in particular claims the Complainant's UK Gambling Commission license registration number (GB 39198) as its own. Consequently, it is clear the Registrant registered and used the disputed domain name with full awareness of the Complainant's business and marks and deliberately portrayed as affiliated with the Complainant.

The circumstances establish that the Registrant used the disputed domain name to cause initial interest confusion among web users seeking the Complainant's official gaming outlets. By drawing web traffic through trademark confusion and redirecting consumers to unrelated casino services for profit, the Registrant's conduct squarely falls within the bad faith factor set out in paragraph 2.1.4 of the IEDR Policy ("Where the Registrant has, through its use of the domain name, intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to a web site or other on-line location by creating confusion with a protected identifier in which the Complainant has rights").

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

7. Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 5 of the IEDR Policy and 14 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <betmgm.ie> be transferred to the Complainant.

/TJ McIntyre/

TJ McIntyre

Sole Panelist

Dated: June 5 2026