

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Barrick Gold of North America, Inc., Barrick Mining Corporation v.
Tanuj Anand
Case No. D2025-3301

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Barrick Gold of North America, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), Barrick Mining Corporation, Canada, represented by Dorsey & Whitney, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is TANUJ ANAND, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <barrickgold.world> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 15, 2025. On August 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 19, 2025, 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 August 19, 2025.

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 August 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on August 20, 2025 and August 21, 2025. A third party sent an email communication to the Center on August 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 2025. 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 first Complainant, Barrick Gold of North America, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, and with a principal place of business in Salt Lake City, Utah, both United States. The second Complainant, Barrick Mining Corporation, is a corporation organized under the laws of Canada, with its principal place of business in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. For ease of reference, the Panel refers to the first and second Complainants as “the Complainant” unless the context indicates otherwise.

According to the Complaint, the Complainant composes one of the largest gold mining operations in the world, using the trademark BARRICK in over 13 countries since 1983. The Complainant also uses the trademark BARRICK GOLD. The Complainant notes that it provides investing services as part of its service portfolio.

The second Complainant is the owner of United States Registered Trademark Number 4578245 in respect of the device and word mark BARRICK, including the stylized depiction of metal bars in a chevron shape above the said word in capital letters and in a stylized typeface, registered on August 5, 2014, in Classes 37, and 42. Said mark contains a claim of first use, and first use in commerce, of January 1995, but such claim has not been independently evidenced on the present record.¹

The Complainant claims that it has used the domain name <barrick.com> for its official online presence since its registration on October 6, 1995, although it provides evidence only of the present use of the website at this domain name together with a copy of the RDAP record relating to such domain name, bearing said registration date. The said website notes that the Complainant trades on both the New York and Toronto Stock Exchanges.

The second Complainant is also the owner of Canadian Registered Trademark Number TMA860536 in respect of the word mark BARRICK GOLD, registered on September 18, 2013 in Classes 35, 36, 37, 40, and 42. Said mark contains a claim of use in Canada since as early as January 1, 1995 but such claim has also not been independently evidenced on the present record.

The Complainant provides evidence that it maintains a substantial presence on social media. For example, the Complainant’s LinkedIn presence under the name “Barrick Mining Corporation” shows that the Complainant has a complement of 14,520 employees, 873,391 followers, and is hiring new employees in multiple different roles including geologists. Said page also shows that the Complainant has company locations in Canada, United States, Peru, Dominican Republic, Argentina, and Chile.² The Complainant’s Facebook page features 188,000 “likes” and 208,000 followers. This page links to the Complainant’s Instagram presence which has 39,300 followers. The Complainant’s <x.com> presence shows that it joined the platform (formerly named “Twitter”) in October 2008, and presently has 63,900 followers. The Complainant’s various social media presences demonstrate that it posts regular updates regarding its corporate activities on each platform.

¹ Such a date, when claimed on a trademark application, is typically of limited evidentiary value on its own in administrative proceedings brought under the Policy (see, for example, *Dow Jones & Company, Inc. v. Idea Studios LLC dba Envent*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1033](#)).

² Although the Complainant did provide screenshots of its LinkedIn page, imaging compression had rendered some of the details, such as the number of followers, difficult to read, and accordingly, the Panel chose to visit the live page in order to be able to capture the relevant detail, having regard to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8. Likewise, the Panel visited the Complainant’s <x.com> presence, and its Facebook page for the same reason, partially legible screenshots of which had been provided, and noted that the latter linked to its Instagram presence which was not on the record.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 19, 2025. The website associated with the disputed domain name features an online panel login page for an entity named “BARRICK GOLD” seeking username and password, or inviting users to create an account. The homepage and a page on which an account would be created both feature what might be described as financial imagery, namely graphs and binary code superimposed on a cityscape at night, and a picture of a golden coin with the Bitcoin logo on it beside an image of a charging golden bull.

Little is known of the Respondent, which has not filed a formal Response in the present proceeding. In informal emails of August 20, 2025, and August 21, 2025, the Respondent claimed that it had registered the disputed domain name on behalf of a client, which it named as “Madhukar Kumar Maurya”. The Respondent also produced with that email various corporate documentation from Indian authorities, namely:

1. Government of India e-Permanent Account Number (e-PAN) Card issued to BARRICK GOLD INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE LIMITED (containing no issue date as such, but referring to the date of incorporation of the said company as May 9, 2025).
2. Government of Gujarat Certificate of Stamp Duty issued on May 24, 2025, relating to a “LEAVE AND LICENSE AGREEMENT” in respect of which the second party is BARRICK GOLD INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE LIMITED.
3. Intimation Receipt from Amdavad Municipal Corporation dated June 16, 2025, being an intimation from an establishment named BARRACK GOLD INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE LTD. that it has commenced in business, the nature of which is described as “TRADING OF GOLD”. The name of the employer is listed as “MADHUKAR KUMAR MAURYA”. This document contains the following rider: “This is just an acknowledgement of the intimation application and not a proof of existence of the business and the place of business as mention [*sic*] in the intimation application.”
4. GST Registration Certificate in respect of a private limited company named BARRICK GOLD INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE LIMITED issued on June 19, 2025.
5. Government of India Importer-Exporter Code issued to BARRICK GOLD INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE LIMITED dated July 23, 2025. The Panel has checked its authenticity online using the instructions on the document.

The third party email received by the Center, dated August 23, 2025, bore to be from “madhukar maurya” (no specific company details or other signature lines provided) and asserted that “we” are registered under the relevant Indian rules and regulations, which may be checked at the Government of India Ministry of Corporate Affairs. The Panel duly checked for the existence of a company named BARRICK GOLD INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE LIMITED on the website for the said Ministry of Corporate Affairs, and noted that such a company exists under registration number 223504, having a date of incorporation of May 9, 2025. Said company lists two directors, one of whom is given as “MADHUKAR KUMAR MAURYA” (a capitalized version of the name matching the name in the third party email address) appointed on the said date of incorporation.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it has used the trademark BARRICK since as early as 1983 in connection with gold and copper mining, and asserts that it enjoys substantial goodwill and name recognition among a large portion of commercial and consumer industries worldwide. The Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights in the mark BARRICK and also notes that it owns multiple corresponding registered trademarks including the BARRICK GOLD marks. The Complainant notes its use of the domain name <barrick.com> to advertise and promote its services, asserting (evidence not provided) that said domain name has been used by it for this purpose since October 1995. The Complainant asserts that its marks are used prominently by it on social media, whereby goodwill has been developed.

The Complainant submits that it used the name “Barrick Gold” for years until changing its name to Barrick Mining Corporation in May 2025, asserting that trade names can fall within the scope of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s BARRICK mark as it consists of this coupled with the descriptive term “gold”, and that the generic Top-Level Domain “.world” does nothing to remove the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant states that the Respondent cannot demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, noting that its use of the BARRICK mark predates this by four decades. The Complainant asserts that its trademarks provide the Respondent with constructive knowledge of its ownership thereof, and that its prominent use of said mark evidences its exclusive rights therein, adding that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Complainant authorized the Respondent to register the disputed domain name or to use its said mark. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the term “Barrick Gold” in connection with supposed cryptocurrency investment and trading services, adding that the login page requires the input of confidential username and password information, and that the Respondent’s intention is to induce Internet users to enter personal and financial information for fraudulent purposes, adding that this is evidence of bad faith for which no legitimate interest may exist. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is attempting to pass itself off as the Complainant, which provides its own investing services, or at least as an affiliate of the Complainant, by inducing the Complainant’s customers to enter confidential login information.

The Complainant states that it has no relationship or affiliation with the Respondent or the disputed domain name despite the Respondent’s alleged misrepresentation of such, asserting that the use of the disputed domain name cannot be bona fide in light of the Complainant’s trademark rights. The Complainant submits that in order for the Respondent to show that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name, it would need to provide adequate extrinsic proof that a corresponding group of consumers who are likely to access its website associate the disputed domain name with the Respondent rather than the Complainant, adding that it cannot make such an assertion due to the association of the Complainant’s marks with the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not making a legitimate fair use of the disputed domain name due to its use for commercial gain by misleading itself as affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, noting that it is unlikely that the Respondent would have selected it without knowing of the reputation of the trademark in question, and asserting that its trademark is well-known. The Complainant argues that the website associated with the disputed domain name creates an impression that Internet users can login to access their accounts with the Complainant. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the specific intent to cause consumer confusion and to free ride on the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s marks, and/or for the purpose of creating a false impression that the Respondent is a member, licensee, or representative of the Complainant, which it is not.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal response and did not directly address the Complainant’s contentions. The Respondent indicated that the disputed domain name belongs to one of its clients, which is doing legitimate business (unspecified) with it in India. The Respondent provided the various corporate documentation described above, and the name of its said client, which appears to match the name of a

director of the company described in the corporate documentation. The third party (whose email address matches the name of the said company director) then asserted that “we (unspecified) are Registered under Government of India ministry of Incorporation [...]”, citing Indian company legislation, and inviting the Panel to contact the Ministry of Corporate Affairs of the Government of India.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary issue: Consolidation of Multiple Complainants

The present Complaint is brought by two affiliated companies. Neither the first nor the second Complainant made any specific request to consolidate their respective complaints against the Respondent. However, the nature of the Complaint suggests that they wish the Panel to order such consolidation.

In considering whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought, 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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.1.

In the present case, the Panel considers that consolidation is both equitable and procedurally efficient, and that the Complainants have a specific common grievance against the Respondent by virtue of being affiliated companies, presumably in the same corporate group structure. The conduct which is the subject of the Complaint could be considered as affecting each of the Complainants in a similar manner. The Panel therefore orders consolidation of the Complainants’ respective Complaints.

6.2. Preliminary issue: Identity of the Respondent

Paragraph 1 of the Rules defines the Respondent as “the holder of a domain-name registration against which a complaint is initiated”. The Panel nevertheless has discretion to substitute or join another entity as a respondent by way of its general powers as set out in paragraph 10(a) of the Rules.

Here, the Panel notes that the holder of the disputed domain name has asserted that it registered this on behalf of a third party. The third party has come forward, and although it has not confirmed that the disputed domain name was registered on its behalf, the tenor of its email suggests that this was the case, in that it asserts that its company is duly registered under Indian law, and the first part of the name of said company appears to match the disputed domain name.

In these circumstances, the Panel is prepared to accept that the disputed domain name was registered for use by the said company, and is therefore content to join it as a Respondent in the present case. Nevertheless, the name of the holder of the disputed domain name will be retained in the instance of this Decision for reasons of continuity and to allow the Registrar to implement an order for transfer of the disputed domain name in the event of the Complainant’s success in the administrative proceeding.

6.3. 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 name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the Complainant cites both BARRICK and BARRICK GOLD registered trademarks for the purposes of the first element assessment, along with claiming unregistered trademark rights, the Panel will focus on the BARRICK GOLD registered trademark for reasons of economy in decision-making.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The absence of a space between the two elements, “barrick” and “gold”, in the disputed domain name is of no significance as spaces are not permitted in domain names for technical reasons.

The applicable gTLD, in this case “.world”, is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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 3.0](#), 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has incorporated a company on or about May 9, 2025, which has a name matching the disputed domain name and has made certain other official registrations for such company between May and July 2025. This does not typically, on its own, lead to a finding of rights and legitimate interests under the Policy (See *Royal Bank of Canada v. RBC Bank*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0672](#)). Something more would be needed along the lines of evidence that the business thus established is trading or intends to trade in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Here, no such evidence has been put forward, and there are no submissions from the Respondent indicating what it is doing or plans to do with the disputed domain name. Consequently, all that the Panel has to go on is the fact that the intimation receipt from Amdavad Municipal Corporation states that the nature of the Respondent’s business is the trading of gold (which receipt is specifically stated to not be proof of the existence of the business), together with the website associated with the disputed domain name, which consists of a login page incorporating financial imagery, including a Bitcoin image suggesting a cryptocurrency connection rather than the trading of gold as such.

On the other side of the balance, the Panel accepts that the Complainant’s evidence of its social media use, which encompasses a substantial following, demonstrates that its BARRICK and BARRICK GOLD marks bear ample goodwill which dates back at least to the establishment of the single dated social media presence, namely 2008. While this evidence is sufficient to make out the Complainant’s case on this topic, the Panel notes that it was necessary to discard many of the Complainant’s submissions regarding its

alleged goodwill because these were not supported by the provision of independent evidence. For example, the Complainant showed that, today, it operates a domain name registered in the early days of the commercial Internet for its official website but put forward no evidence of historic use in connection with its business, such as historic screenshots that might have been available from the Internet Archive “Wayback Machine”, or similar. The Complainant instead largely relied upon conclusory allegations or self-generated evidence such as an image of its present day website. The latter does at least indicate that the Complainant trades on two recognized public stock exchanges, whereby it may be expected to possess a certain notoriety arising from that fact alone.

The Complainant also demonstrates that it is the owner of the BARRICK and BARRICK GOLD registered trademarks. The latter was registered as early as September 18, 2013, namely, over a decade ago, and represents an exact match for the Second-Level Domain of the disputed domain name. Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The impression created by the disputed domain name is therefore that it is a representation of the Complainant’s trademark. It is notable that the Respondent has made no attempt to set out any alternative explanation for its choice of domain name and corporate name, such as any nexus that there might be between itself and the term “barrick”.

The website associated with the disputed domain name suggests that it is a login portal for some sort of financial dealing, at least based upon the accompanying imagery. Again, the Panel has received no explanation from the Respondent as to what it is actually doing, and in the absence of such must conclude that any offering of goods or services made thereby could not be bona fide because it free rides on the goodwill inherent in the Complainant’s mark, a mark that is associated with gold mining and marketing of precious metals. Importantly, the Respondent has made no attempt to counter the Complainant’s allegations that the said website is designed to extract personal data from the Complainant’s customers who may be confused into believing that it is associated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel notes for completeness that in addition to excluding the provisions of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy as discussed above, paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy may likewise be excluded as the Respondent has not shown that it is commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name. Registration of such a name with the appropriate bodies, such as corporate registrars or tax authorities, is insufficient on its own. What is needed is something more than being incidentally known by the corporate identifier, namely independent and sustained examples of secondary material such as websites or blogs, news articles, correspondence with independent third parties, and publications referring to the respondent being commonly known by the relevant name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3. The provisions of paragraph 4(c)(iii) may likewise be excluded as the corporate information produced by the Respondent indicates an intent to use the disputed domain name for commercial purposes, and no allegation of any actual or intended noncommercial or fair use has been put forward by it.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is an exact match for the Complainant’s BARRICK GOLD trademark and therefore strongly suggests affiliation with it. In light of the Complainant’s substantial social media presence, its prominence via listings on public stock exchanges, and the absence of any explanation by the Respondent for its choice of name, the Panel finds it more probable than not that the

disputed domain name was registered in the knowledge of the Complainant's mark and with intent to target it. As indicated in the preceding section, the registration of a matching name with the competent authorities does not on its own exclude the possibility that the registrant is a cybersquatter who is intending to take unfair advantage of another party's trademark rights, particularly if, as here, such corporate registrations post-date the registration of that trademark (and the establishment of related goodwill) to a considerable extent.

It is clear that the Complainant's BARRICK GOLD mark is associated with the mining and trading of gold. Insofar as the Panel may rely on the Respondent's corporate documentation, the trading of gold is stated to be the business or proposed business of its company. The notion that the Respondent as proposed trader in gold somehow came by the disputed domain name independently of the Complainant's mark, in the absence of any alternative explanation, would stretch credulity beyond breaking point. In all of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website associated with the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

In addition, the Complainant has asserted that the Respondent's login page on the website associated with the disputed domain name may be intentionally designed to capture personal data from the Complainant's customers who will believe it to be an official website of the Complainant. This is a serious allegation, which calls for a response from the Respondent. Although the Respondent has shown that it is capable of communicating with the Center, it has made no attempt to answer the Complainant's allegation on this topic, and the Panel makes the reasonable inference that it has no suitable explanation available to it that would demonstrate registration and use of the disputed domain name in good faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 name <barrickgold.world> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2025