Anonymized decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108171

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108171
Time of filing	2025-11-30 17:49:20
Domain names	monaco.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	MARQUES DE L'ETAT DE MONACO (dba MONACO BRANDS)

Complainant representative

Organization	TAYER Avocat

Respondent

Name	[redacted]

Respondent representative

Organization	[redacted]

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for MONACO (the "MONACO trademark"), including the following representative registrations:

– the Monaco trademark MONACO (word) with registration No. 10.27959, registered on 14 July 2010 for goods and services in International Classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45;

– the International trademark MONACO (word) with registration No. 1069254, registered on 1 December 2010 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 35, 38, 39, 41 and 43; and

– the International trademark MONACO (word) with registration No. 1222204, registered on 18 June 2014 for goods and services in International Classes 3, 7, 30, 31 and 36.

The Complainant is also the owner of the following United States trademarks, in which the "MONACO" element is disclaimed:

– the combined trademark with registration No. 6445488, registered on August 10, 2021 for goods and services in International Classes 14 and 35;

– the combined trademark with registration No. 6709178, registered on April 26, 2022 for goods and services in International Classes 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 35. 41 and 45; and

– the combined trademark with registration No. 6940794, registered on January 3, 2023 for goods and services in International Classes 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 18, 20, 21, 28, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 43.

The Panel notes that at the time of issuance of the present decision there are many live trademark registrations owned by third parties that include "MONACO" and are valid in the European Union or in the United States.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Monegasque public limited company whose stated purpose is to protect, value and defend the trademarks, trade names and the image of "MONACO" and "MONTE-CARLO".

The disputed domain name was initially registered on 6 July 1995 by the entity Monaco Enterprises Inc., established in 1971 in the United States by the late Mr. Eugene Monaco. After Mr. Monaco passed away, the disputed domain name was inherited by his daughter, Ms. Noelle Barno. After her divorce in 2024, Ms. Barno resumed the use of her maiden surname Monaco.

In 2024, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking webpage with varying content, including pay-per-click links to credit card or banking matters, pain relief, travel and tourism. On 20 September 2024, the Complainant contacted by e-mail Ms Barno with an offer to acquire it for a price that covered the out-of-pocket costs for it. In early 2025, Ms. Monaco engaged a broker for the sale of the disputed domain name. On 16 January 2025, the broker distributed an e-mail message to numerous recipients with the title "Exclusive Opportunity: Acquire Monaco.com – A Prestigious Geodomain", containing an invitation for the submission of offers for the purchase of the disputed domain name with an initial deadline on 5 February 2025. One of the recipients of this message was the Complainant.

With a Domain Name Purchase and Sale Agreement dated 19 September 2025, Ms. Monaco (referred in this decision as the "Seller") sold the disputed domain name to the entity Irwin Inc. (referred in this decision as the "Buyer"), registered in 2024 in the United States. To secure the payment of the agreed price for the disputed domain name, the Seller and the Buyer engaged an escrow agent (the "Escrow Agent" – the Respondent in the present proceeding) through an Escrow Agreement dated 23 September 2025. By this Escrow Agreement, the parties agreed that the Seller will transfer title to the disputed domain name to the Escrow Agent in trust for the benefit of Buyer and Seller, and that the Escrow Agent will hold the disputed domain name by private registration and subsequently transfer title to it to the Buyer if the full purchase price is paid. Since a portion of the purchase price has not been paid by the date of issuance of the present decision, the disputed domain name is still being held by the Escrow Agent.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to a landing webpage with the text "Your Next Generation Revenue Platform". It has mail-exchange ("MX") records enabled.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name has been acquired with the intent to resell it at an extremely high price, and to collect personal data from Internet users.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its MONACO trademark because it identically reproduces the trademark without any other elements. The Complainant adds that the addition of the ".com" Top-Level Domain does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has not authorized it to use the Complainant's MONACO trademark or to acquire the disputed domain name.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a pay-per-click webpage, and that now it resolves to a landing webpage offering to book a demo for "Your Next Generation Revenue Platform" and has active MX settings. According to the Complainant, this indicates that the disputed domain name is intended to be used for phishing purposes or for the collection of personal data. The Complainant also states that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale, which according to it cannot give rise to rights and legitimate interests in it.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's MONACO trademark. According to the Complainant, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the MONACO trademark and the image of the Principality of Monaco, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have acquired the disputed domain name without actual knowledge of Monaco and of the Complainant's rights in the MONACO trademark. The Complainant states that it is impossible to consider any legitimate use of the disputed domain name, and that it is highly probable that it was created to send scam e-mails to the Complainant's clients. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website at the disputed domain name, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark.

The Complainant states that there was probably a change in ownership of the disputed domain name in 2024 or 2025, and although the Respondent is not its original registrant, its attempt to sell the disputed domain name for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name is evidence of bad faith.

With its supplemental submission, the Complainant makes the following statements:

The Complainant notes that the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Buyer will only happen on the date of full payment of the purchase price, and its ownership will remain with the Seller or with the Escrow Agent. For this reason, the Complainant maintains, that the identity of the Respondent cannot be amended, and only the Escrow Agent should be the Respondent in this proceeding.

The Complainant states that it did not receive any response to its e-mail of 20 September 2024 to the broker of the disputed domain name, which letter contained an offer to buy the disputed domain name, and the only communication that it received from the broker was the invitation for submission of offers for the purchase of the disputed domain name that was sent on 16 January 2025.

As to the argument in the Response that the Complainant's United States trademarks disclaim their "MONACO" element, the Complainant points out that it has other trademark registrations that do not disclaim this element.

The Complainant also disputes the credibility of the statements in the Response that the Buyer has managed to raise millions of US Dollars for its business project from investors in a couple of months, and states that the word "MONACO" has no relation to the name of the Buyer.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent, which is the Escrow Agent in the purchase and sale transaction for the disputed domain name entered into on 19 September 2025, did not itself file a Response. A letter dated 18 December 2025 is annexed to the Response, whereby the Respondent makes the following statements:

- that it is a licensed provider of escrow services and is a neutral custodian of the disputed domain name pursuant to a structured payment transaction between two parties;

- that the person named as Respondent in the Complaint is an officer of the Respondent, and neither this person, nor the Respondent is the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name, but their names appear in this proceeding merely as a consequence of the neutral custodial role of an escrow agent;

- that it has received notice of the present proceeding and has in turn notified the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name, and that it will take no further action or appear in this proceeding;

- that its understanding is that the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name has appointed counsel to represent it and will request an amendment of the named Respondent in this proceeding, and that it concurs with such request to amend the named Respondent; and

- that it requests the Panel to refrain from republication of unfounded allegations tending to harm the reputation of the Respondent and its officer in their mere administrative capacity as a neutral service provider to the transacting parties in relation to the disputed domain name.

INTERVENING PARTY:

The Response in this proceeding was filed by the Buyer of the disputed domain name, and contains the statements summarized below.

The Buyer states that the present dispute involves an asset that has been in the Monaco family for two generations, and which was recently sold to a start-up business having nothing to do with any goods or services in which the Complainant has trademark rights.

The Buyer submits that it makes preparations for the launch of a sales automation and customer relationship management platform, including the substantial investment in the disputed domain name itself, the engagement of counsel for trademark clearance, trademark advice and filing, the conclusion of various vendor contracts, and interactions with vendors, customers and investors under the name "Monaco". The Buyer further states that it has raised millions of US Dollars from investors, hired over 30 employees and has spent several hundred thousand US Dollars on preparations for its planned launch and for its current operation in stealth mode. The Buyer adds that it purchased the domain name <monaco.co> in October 2024, and that on 27 October 2025, it

filed a trademark application in the United States for “MONACO” with application No.99,465,051 for downloadable software and software-as-a-service relating to sales automation and customer relationship management. The Buyer claims that in view of these preparations and expenses, which were undertaken prior to notice of this dispute, it has substantial interests at stake in this proceeding as the purchaser and beneficial owner of the disputed domain name.

The Buyer further states that the Complainant’s allegations concerning Ms. Monaco’s broker’s advertisement for sale of the disputed domain name do not show bad faith, because Ms. Monaco was entitled to sell this business asset to whomever she pleased on any terms she might find acceptable, and that in any event, the interaction between the Complainant and Ms. Monaco’s broker is irrelevant to the Respondent’s purchase of the disputed domain name on 19 September 2025.

The Buyer denies the Complainant’s allegations that the disputed domain name is being used for phishing purposes, and notes that all of its staff use e-mail addresses set up at the disputed domain name to conduct their correspondence.

The Buyer further states that it has no intention of selling the disputed domain name to anyone, and has never attempted to do so.

The Buyer emphasizes that before agreeing to purchase the disputed domain name, it sought advice from a highly regarded intellectual property law firm in the United States, and was advised that its planned use of the disputed domain name was unrelated to any goods or services for which the Complainant might claim rights, and that the Complainant would have difficulty asserting a successful claim in view of the express limitations of its United States trademark registrations which disclaim their “MONACO” element.

In its supplemental submission, the Buyer makes the following statements:

The Buyer points out that Ms. Monaco, the Seller of the disputed domain name, had the surname Monaco since birth, and then again since her divorce, and the Panel is given discretion to address changes in Respondent identification under Paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP Rules. As to the Escrow Agent, the circumstances under which it became the registrant of the disputed domain name are evident from the sale agreement between Ms. Monaco and Irwin Inc., and show that the Escrow Agent did not have any bad faith intent in relation to the Complainant in the performance of its contracted escrow services. The Buyer submits that, regardless of whether one considers the Escrow Agent or Ms. Monaco to be the proper Respondent, the fact is that the Buyer is the user and the contractual assignee of the disputed domain name, and both the Escrow Agent and Ms. Monaco agree that the Buyer is the proper Respondent in this proceeding.

The Buyer also explains that Ms. Monaco did not herself reply to the Complainant’s September 2024 e-mail, because she forwarded it to her broker who made a telephone call to Complainant’s counsel.

The Buyer also points out that the statements in the Response are supported by evidence that includes a letter by the Escrow Agent, correspondence with a leading IP law firm, contractual documents with investors, bank account statements, a sworn declaration of Ms. Monaco, and a sworn declaration of the owner of the Buyer, while the Complainant does not submit any contrary evidence.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has failed to show that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has failed to show that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

1. Parties to this proceeding

The Buyer submits that since it is the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name, and the same is being custodially held by the Escrow Agent pursuant to a contractual arrangement, the Buyer is entitled to participate in this proceeding and submit a Response against the Complaint.

The Panel notes that Paragraph 1 of the Rules defines "Respondent" as "the holder of a domain-name registration against which a complaint is initiated". The Registrar has confirmed that the registrant of the disputed domain name is the Respondent.

The Panel, once appointed, has discretion to determine the proper respondent against whom the case should proceed. See Paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP Rules, last sentence, and section 4.4.5 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"). In exercising their discretion in similar circumstances, previous Panels have generally considered, among others, whether the identity of the beneficial holder is disclosed, whether the beneficial holder submits arguments explaining its position, and whether the relationship between the registrant of the disputed domain name and its beneficial holder is clear. See Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP v. Job, WIPO Case No. D2020-0592.

Here, the Buyer of the disputed domain name has disclosed its identity and has provided clear and convincing evidence that it has purchased the disputed domain name from its previous owner, Ms. Monaco, and that the two of them have jointly appointed the Respondent to act as their Escrow Agent in the transaction and to hold the disputed domain name on their behalf until the full payment of the agreed purchase price. The Buyer has also submitted a declaration by Ms. Monaco, whereby she confirms that the disputed domain name was sold to the Buyer and is being held for it by the Escrow Agent while the Buyer completes the payment schedule for the price.

The Complainant objects to the joinder request of the Buyer, but has not provided any evidence indicating that any of its statements or evidence submitted by it is untrue.

The Respondent has received notice of the present proceeding. It has however refrained from making any submissions itself, has not objected to the filing of the Response by the Buyer of the disputed domain name, has not disputed any of the statements and evidence attached to the Response, and has not objected to any of the procedural actions carried out by the Buyer of the disputed domain name in this proceeding. The Panel regards this silence of the Respondent as a tacit validation of the submissions and actions made by the Buyer of the disputed domain name in the present proceeding.

UDRP panels have held that the registrant as listed in the WhoIs is a properly-named Respondent but the submissions of other interested parties may be considered for purposes of the panel's decision. See Facebook, Inc., Instagram, LLC, WhatsAPP Inc. v. Osbil Technology, Osbil Technology Ltd., WIPO Case No. D2018-2906.

Considering all the circumstances of this case, the Panel concludes that, although the Buyer has not become the owner of the disputed domain name yet, it has shown that it has a legitimate interest to participate in the present proceeding to protect the value of its investment in the disputed domain name and its legitimate expectation to obtain secure ownership over it once it has paid the agreed price.

Therefore, in exercise of its powers under Paragraph 10 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel admits the Buyer as a party to this proceeding, admits the Response and the other submissions and actions made by the Buyer and the attached evidence, and decides to take them into account when reaching its decision in this proceeding.

2. Supplemental submissions

The Complainant and the Buyer have submitted supplemental submissions.

Having reviewed them together with the Complaint and the Response, the Panel finds that these supplemental submissions address issues that could not have been contemplated and addressed in the Complaint and in the Response, which makes them relevant and justifies their acceptance in the proceeding.

Therefore, the Panel decides to accept and take into account the Parties' supplemental submissions.

3. Redaction of the name of the Respondent

The Respondent requests the Panel to refrain from republication of unfounded allegations tending to harm the reputation of the Respondent and its officer in their mere administrative capacity as a neutral service provider to the transacting parties in relation to the disputed domain name.

Taking into account that the Complainant has failed to establish that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and has failed to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, the Panel accepts the request of the Respondent and considers that the proper way to do so is to redact the name of the Respondent in this decision.

Therefore, the Panel decides to redact the name of the Respondent in this decision.

Having decided the above issues, the Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP have been met, and there is no reason why it would be inappropriate to render a decision on the substance of the dispute.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a), a complainant must prove each of the following to justify the transfer of a domain name:

(i) the domain name is 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 name; and

(iii) the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Identical or confusingly similar

The Panel takes note of the argument raised in the Response that the United States trademark registrations of the Complainant's trademark disclaim their "MONACO" element. Nevertheless, the Complainant has provided evidence and has thus established that it has rights in a number of registrations of MONACO as a word trademark without a disclaimer.

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 ".com" gTLD section of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the word trademark MONACO without the addition of any other elements.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the MONACO trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Rights and legitimate interests

The statements in the Response are supported by substantial, clear and convincing evidence. Although the Complainant disputes these statements and evidence, it has not submitted any evidence that disproves them, or any convincing argument why they should not be given credit by the Panel. The Panel is persuaded by the evidence submitted with the Response and reaches the following conclusions on its basis:

The Response includes evidence that the disputed domain name has been registered, owned and used by two generations of people bearing the surname Monaco in the United States in the period 1995 – 2025, and that on 19 September 2025, the then owner of the disputed domain name – Ms. Noelle Monaco (the Seller), entered into a yet uncompleted sales transaction for the disputed domain name with the Buyer. This evidence leads to the conclusion that Ms Monaco, being commonly known by an identical name, has rights and legitimate interests in it the disputed domain name pursuant to Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy (although she is not a party to the present proceeding).

The Response also includes evidence that on 23 September 2025, the Respondent was contracted by the Seller and the Buyer to act as Escrow Agent for the purposes of the sale of the disputed domain name. Part of the Respondent's role is to hold the disputed domain name in trust for the benefit of the Buyer and the Seller, and to transfer title to it to the Buyer or to the Seller upon the occurrence of certain conditions defined it the escrow agreement. Since a portion of the purchase price has not been paid by the date of issuance of the present decision, the disputed domain name is still being held by the Escrow Agent. This evidence supports a conclusion that the Escrow Agent became the nominal registrant of the disputed domain name and holds it upon legitimate instructions by the Seller – a party that has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as discussed in the previous paragraph. In other words, the Escrow Agent has rights in the disputed domain name which arise from a legitimate transaction with a legitimate party, and there is no evidence to suggest otherwise.

Further, the Response includes evidence that before notice of the present dispute the Buyer has started preparations for use of the brand MONACO for its planned sales automation and customer relationship management platform, has made arrangements related to the launch of this platform and has attracted millions of US Dollars of investments for it, that it was advised by a major law firm for the intellectual property aspects of using the brand MONACO in the United States, and that it has purchased the domain name <monaco.co> and filed a trademark application for MONACO in the United States. There is no evidence of targeting of the Complainant by the Buyer, and, as discussed above in this decision, the Complainant's trademark registrations in the United States disclaim their "MONACO" element. This leads the Panel to the conclusion that before any notice of the dispute to it, the Buyer has carried out demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name and the trade name MONACO, which corresponds to the disputed domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Coupled with the fact that the Buyer has entered into a legitimate purchase transaction for the disputed domain name with the Seller and has made a substantial investment in it, this supports a finding that the Buyer has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Considering all the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has failed to establish the second element of the test under the Policy.

Bad faith

As discussed in section 3.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the date on which the current registrant acquired the disputed domain name is the date a panel will consider in assessing bad faith.

Since the Respondent was registered as holder of the disputed domain name pursuant to the Escrow Agreement on 23 September 2025, the Panel regards this date as the date to be considered for the purposes of the assessment whether the disputed domain

name was acquired in bad faith by the Respondent. The evidence in the case shows that the Respondent became the transferee of the disputed domain name in performance of its function of a licensed Escrow Agent holding the disputed domain name in trust for the benefit of the Buyer and the Seller, and it is obligated to transfer the disputed domain name to the Buyer or to the Seller depending on the occurrence of specific circumstances detailed in the Escrow Agreement. Therefore, the Respondent is legitimately acting for the benefit of third parties, and there is nothing to suggest that it may be doing so in bad faith.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that in 2024, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking webpage with varying content, including pay-per-click links to credit card or banking matters, pain relief, travel and tourism, and that in 16 January 2025, a broker acting on behalf of the then owner of the disputed domain name distributed by e-mail an invitation for the submission of offers for the purchase of the disputed domain name. These events however took place before the Respondent became the registrant of the disputed domain name on behalf of the Seller and the Buyer, and there is no reason to accept that the Respondent may be responsible for them.

For the same reasons, the Buyer cannot be held responsible for any events related to the disputed domain name that have taken place prior to the conclusion of the purchase agreement for the disputed domain name on 19 September 2025. Considering also that the Buyer has demonstrated its preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide activity prior to the notice of the dispute (as discussed in the section on rights and legitimate interests) and that there is no evidence of targeting of the Complainant, there is no basis for a finding that the Buyer has acted in bad faith either.

For completeness, and although the Seller Ms Monaco is not a party to the present proceeding, the Panel observes that there is also no basis for a finding of bad faith in respect of her, as she has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name stemming from the fact that it is identical to her surname, and since she was free to use the disputed domain name for any legitimate commercial or other activities, as well as to offer it for sale at any price.

Considering all the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has failed to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH)

Paragraph 15(e) of the UDRP Rules provides that, if "after considering the submissions the panel finds that the complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or was brought primarily to harass the domain-name holder, the panel shall declare in its decision that the complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding".

RDNH is furthermore defined under the UDRP Rules as "using the UDRP in bad faith to attempt to deprive a registered domain-name holder of a domain name." Panels have also referred to paragraphs 3(b)(xiii) and (xiv) of the UDRP Rules in addressing possible RDNH scenarios.

As discussed in section 4.16 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, Panels have consistently found that the mere lack of success of a complaint is not itself sufficient for a finding of RDNH.

Here, the Complainant has not established the second and the third elements of the test under the Policy, and the Complaint fails. However, there is no basis for a finding that the Complainant knew that it could not succeed as to any of the required three elements, or that the Complainant ought to have known it could not succeed under any fair interpretation of facts reasonably available prior to the filing of the Complaint.

There is no evidence showing that prior to the filing of the Response, the Complainant knew about the sale transaction for the disputed domain name in September 2025 between the Seller and the Buyer and about the participation of the Respondent in this transaction as an Escrow Agent, so it may have misunderstood who was behind the use of the disputed domain name prior to this transaction and the offer for sale in early 2025. There is also no evidence showing that prior to the filing of the Response the Complainant may have known about the plans of the Buyer to use the disputed domain name for its bona fide business and its preparations to do so.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that a finding of RDNH against the Complainant is not warranted.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Rejected

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

PANELLISTS

Name	Assen Alexiev

Name	**Igor Motsnyi**
Name	**Dawn Osborne**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-26

Publish the Decision