



Asian Domain Name Dispute Resolution Centre

kuala lumpur

(Kuala Lumpur Office)

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Case No.	AIAC/ADNDRC-1501-2025
Complainant:	Genting International Management Pte Limited
Respondent:	Kieran Holmes
Disputed Domain Name:	<resworld.online>

1. The Parties and Contested Domain Name

The Complainant is **Genting International Management Pte Limited**, of Singapore, represented by Lim Zhi Jian, Malaysia.

The Respondent is **Kieran Holmes**, of Afghanistan¹, not represented.

The domain name at issue is <resworld.online> (the “**disputed domain name**”), registered by Respondent with Namecheap, Inc. (the “**Registrar**”), of United States.

2. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the Kuala Lumpur Office of the Asian Domain Name Dispute Resolution Centre (“**ADNDRC**”) on 8 September 2025, regarding the domain name <resworld.online>. The ADNDRC acknowledged the receipt of the Complaint on 9 September 2025. On 2 October 2025, the ADNDRC submitted a verification request to the Registrar in relation to the disputed domain name. On 2 October 2025, the ADNDRC verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “**Policy**” or “**UDRP**”), and the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “**Rules**”). On 3 October 2025, the ADNDRC notified the Respondent of the Complaint. The due date of the Response was 23 October 2025. The Respondent did not file a formal Response. The ADNDRC appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on 28 October 2025.

3. Factual background

¹ According to Google Maps, the street address, postal code and phone number indicated by the Respondent are actually located in the United Kingdom.

The Complainant is a subsidiary company of Genting Berhad and Genting Singapore PLC, all of which are part of the Genting Group. The core businesses of the Genting Group include casino business, leisure and hospitality.

The Complainant or other members of the Genting Group are owners of various trademark registrations for RESORT WORLD (the “**RESORT WORLD trademark**”), including the following representative registrations:

– the Brunei trademark  (RESORT WORLD) with registration No. 39300, registered on 29 January 2008 for services in International Classes 41 and 42. This trademark registration is owned by the Complainant;

– the European Union trademark  (RESORT WORLD BARCELONA) with registration No. 016684011, registered on 24 August 2017 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, 28, 35, 36, 41 and 43. This trademark is owned by the entity Genting Intellectual Property Pte Ltd, Singapore;

– the Vietnam trademark  (RESORT WORLD) with registration No. 4-0341455-000, registered on 3 January 2020 for goods in International Class 16. This trademark is owned by the entity Genting Intellectual Property Pte Ltd, Singapore;

– the New Zealand trademark  (RESORT WORLD) with registration No. 782273, registered on 10 July 2008 for services in International Classes 41 and 43. This trademark is owned by the entity Genting Intellectual Property Pte Ltd, Singapore; and

– the Malaysian trademark  (RESORT WORLD AT SENTOSA) with registration No. 06019105, registered on 4 September 2008 for goods in International Class 16. This trademark is owned by the entity Genting Berhad, Malaysia.

The disputed domain name <resworld.online> was registered on 8 August 2025. It is currently inactive. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website with the title “Resorts World”, which prominently displayed the Complainant’s trademark  and its logo 

The website offered information on casino gaming, dining, hotel reservations and related entertainment offerings, and displayed the text:

Everything you need to plan your next trip to Resorts World is right at your fingertips! Easily access the latest gaming promotions, check your account balance and available offers, make dining and hotel reservations, unlock app-exclusive deals, and much more! With thousands of slot machines and electronic table games at all of our properties, plus hundreds of live table games in the Catskills and the Bahamas, Resorts World casinos offer non-stop excitement and action! Located in New York - Catskills (Monticello), Hudson Valley (Newburgh) and New York City (Jamaica), as well as in Bimini, Bahamas—

there's no reason not to come experience the thrill! Gambling age varies by property.

4. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant's contentions may be summarized as follows:

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its RESORT WORLD trademark, because it is a combination of "res" and "world", which misleads Internet users that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the content of the website at the disputed domain name, which provides information on casino gaming, dining, hotel reservations, and related entertainment offerings, while also inviting users to download its mobile application, further amplifies the false representation of association with the Complainant.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It points out that it and its affiliates own the RESORT WORLD trademark since 2007, and that they have not authorized the Respondent to use this trademark or to register and use the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name and the associated website are likely to deceive Internet users that they are affiliated to the Complainant, and this may damage the Complainant's business reputation.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the RESORT WORLD trademark and its goodwill, and with the intent to prevent the Complainant and its affiliates from using it. In the Complainant's submission, the Respondent attempts to gain unlawful financial benefit and to disrupt the business of the Complainant and its affiliates and to damage their reputation.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a Response to the Complaint.

5. Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that each of these three findings must be made in order for a Complainant to prevail:

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

A) Identical / Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the Complainant to show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it and its affiliates from the Genting Group hold *various registrations of the RESORT WORLD trademark in many countries around the world*. As discussed in section 1.4.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“**WIPO Overview 3.0**”), a trademark owner’s affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the Policy for purposes of standing to file a complaint. This supports a conclusion that the Complainant has established its rights in the RESORT WORLD trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel notes that a common practice has emerged under the Policy to disregard in appropriate circumstances the general Top-Level Domain (“**gTLD**”) section of domain names for the purposes of the comparison under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). The Panel sees no reason not to follow the same approach here, so it will disregard the “.online” gTLD section of the disputed domain name. See section 1.11 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

The disputed domain name incorporates the sequence “resworld”, which appears as a *contraction of the RESORT WORLD trademark, and this trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name*. As discussed in section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing.

As further discussed in section 1.15 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, in some instances panels have taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears *prima facie* that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name. Such content will often also bear on assessment of the second and third elements, namely whether there may be legitimate co-existence or fair use, or an intent to create user confusion. Here, the website at the disputed domain name targeted the Complainant’s RESORT WORLD trademark and prominently displayed it, while also advertising various gambling, entertainment and hospitality services identical or complementary to those offered by the Complainant, thus impersonating the same. *This shows that the Respondent is likely to have chosen the disputed domain name targeting the RESORT WORLD trademark.*

Considering the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the RESORT WORLD trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B) Rights and Legitimate Interests

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, because it has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the RESORT WORLD trademark or to register the disputed domain name, and because its website was designed to deceive Internet users that it is affiliated with the Complainant. Thus, the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has not provided any plausible explanation of the reasons why it has registered the disputed domain name and how it intends to use it.

The disputed domain name incorporates an abbreviated form of the RESORT WORLD trademark of the Complainant, which is recognizable in it. In combination with the content of the associated website, which prominently displays the RESORT WORLD trademark in its distinctive design and the Complainant's logo, and offers services identical or complementary to those offered by the Complainant, this may mislead Internet users that the disputed domain name, the associated website, and the services offered there, are being provided by or are otherwise related to the Complainant. In the absence of any arguments or evidence to the contrary, the above leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the Respondent, being well aware of the goodwill of the Complainant's RESORT WORLD trademark, has registered the disputed domain name and activated the associated website targeting this trademark in an attempt to commercially exploit the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark for offering competitive services. The Panel does not regard such conduct as giving rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C) Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may establish bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.

The Panel is of the opinion that a number of factors indicate bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name 17 years after the Complainant and its affiliates registered and started using the RESORT WORLD trademark. The Respondent has incorporated an abbreviated form of this trademark in the disputed domain name, and has associated it to a website that offered competing services while prominently displaying the same trademark and the

Complainant's logo and not identifying the provider of the website. This shows that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant with the registration and use of the disputed domain name in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's RESORT WORLD trademark as to the source or endorsement by the Complainant of the services offered on the Respondent's website.

The Panel therefore finds that these circumstances support a conclusion that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

6. 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 <resworld.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

Assen Alexiev

Assen Alexiev
Panelist

Dated: 31 October 2025