

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Degussa Holding AG v. klaus berg, Klaus Fritz, Heizendirekt, Daniel Schuller  
Case No. D2025-4809

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Degussa Holding AG, Switzerland, represented by Bettinger Scheffelt Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondents are klaus berg, Germany; Klaus Fritz, Heizendirekt, Germany; and Daniel Schuller, Germany.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <degussa-anlage.biz>, <degussa-anlage.club>, <degussa-anlage.org>, <degussa-anlage.shop>, <degussa-anlage.top>, <degussa-barren.biz>, <degussa-barren.investments>, <degussa-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-barren.top>, <degussa.best>, <degussa.blog>, <degussa.cam>, <degussa.casa>, <degussa.cfd>, <degussa.cv>, <degussa.direct>, <degussa.fit>, <degussa-goldbarren.biz>, <degussa-goldbarren.club>, <degussa-goldbarren.gmbh>, <degussa-goldbarren.gold>, <degussa-gold-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-goldbarren.kaufen>, <degussa-gold-barren.org>, <degussa-goldbarren.org>, <degussa-gold-barren.shop>, <degussa-gold-barren.top>, <degussa-goldbarren.top>, <degussa-gold.gold>, <degussa-goldhandel.best>, <degussa-goldhandel.click>, <degussa-goldhandel.club>, <degussa-goldhandel.digital>, <degussa-goldhandel.investments>, <degussa-goldhandel.kaufen>, <degussa-goldhandel.plus>, <degussa-goldhandel.top>, <degussa-gold.kaufen>, <degussa-goldladen.biz>, <degussa-goldladen.shop>, <degussa-goldladen.top>, <degussa-goldshop.club>, <degussa-goldshop.kaufen>, <degussa-goldshop.org>, <degussa-goldshop.top>, <degussa-gold.top>, <degussa-handel.gold>, <degussa.help>, <degussa.host>, <degussa.icu>, <degussa.ink>, <degussa.investments>, <degussa.lat>, <degussa.plus>, <degussa.sbs>, <degussa.site>, <degussa.space>, <degussa.support>, <degussa.tech>, <degussa.ws>, <gold-barren-degussa.investments>, <gold-barren-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-barren-degussa.shop>, <gold-barren-degussa.top>, <gold-handel-degussa.cc>, <gold-handel-degussa.club>, <gold-handel-degussa.investments>, <gold-handel-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-handel-degussa.top>, <handel-degussa.investments>, <handel-degussa.kaufen>, and <handel-degussa.top> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 19, 2025. On November 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 20, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (See PrivacyGuardian.org, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY /PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 28, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 28, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on December 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on January 9, 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 company specialized in precious metals trading, refining, and investments.

With a long-standing history dating back to the 19th century, originally derived from the Deutsche Gold-und Silber-Scheideanstalt, the Complainant either directly or through its operating subsidiaries and licensees, overseas, deals with a broad range of commercial activities, including: production and distribution of investment-grade precious metal bars and coins, including gold, silver, platinum, and palladium; operation of a network of retail stores and showrooms offering bullion products and related services in major European cities; provision of secure high-security storage solutions for precious metals; purchase and recycling of scrap gold and old jewelry; sale of numismatic and commemorative items for collectors; and investors and operation of online platforms enabling direct sale and information services to clients.

The Complainant is the holding company of the Degussa Group, which includes the following major subsidiaries: Degussa Goldhandel GmbH (Germany), headquartered in Frankfurt am Main, with retail branches in Augsburg, Berlin, Düsseldorf, Hamburg, Hannover, Köln, München, Nürnberg, Pforzheim, and Stuttgart; Degussa Goldhandel AG (Switzerland), based in Zurich; Degussa S.A.U. in Madrid, Spain; and Sharps Pixley Ltd., a wholly owned subsidiary operating in London, United Kingdom.

The Degussa Group operates more than a dozen retail locations and showrooms in Germany, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and Spain, with a strong and growing customer base throughout Europe.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for DEGUSSA, including the following, as per trademark registration certificates submitted as annexes to the Complaint:

- European Union trademark registration No. 008749012 for DEGUSSA (figurative mark), filed on December 11, 2009, and registered on May 20, 2010, in classes 14, and 36;
- International trademark registration No. 1262010 for DEGUSSA (figurative mark), registered on April 23, 2015, in classes 14, and 36;
- International trademark registration No. 1249667 for DEGUSSA (figurative mark), registered on April 16, 2015, in classes 14, and 36; and
- International trademark registration No. 431497A for DEGUSSA (figurative mark), registered on June 8, 1977, in international class 14.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain names <degussa.com>, registered on April 28, 1994, and <degussa-goldhandel.de>, registered on July 19, 2011, both redirect to the website “www.degussa.com”, the Complainant’s central platform for e-commerce, customer education, and brand communication under the trademark DEGUSSA.

Additional domain names belonging to the Complainant include <degussa-goldhandel.com>, registered on July 23, 2012, <degussa.eu>, registered on March 26, 2006, <degussa.shop>, registered on September 26, 2016, and <degussa-goldhandel.net>, registered on July 23, 2012.

The disputed domain names <degussa.plus> and <degussa.support>, registered on April 17, 2025; <degussa.best>, <degussa.blog>, <degussa.cfd>, and <degussa.sbs>, registered on April 22, 2025; <degussa.site> registered on May 5, 2025; <degussa.help>, <degussa.icu>, and <degussa.lat>, registered on May 17, 2025; <degussa.cam>, <degussa.fit>, and <degussa.ink>, registered on May 23, 2025; <degussa.direct> registered on May 30, 2025; <degussa-goldhandel.best>, <degussa-goldhandel.club>, <degussa-goldhandel.digital>, and <degussa-goldhandel.plus>, registered on June 2, 2025; and <degussa-goldhandel.click> registered on September 4, 2025, all resolve to inactive websites.

The disputed domain names <degussa-anlage.biz>, <degussa-anlage.club>, <degussa-anlage.org>, <degussa-anlage.shop>, <degussa-anlage.top>, <degussa-barren.biz>, <degussa-barren.investments>, <degussa-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-barren.top>, <degussa-gold-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-gold-barren.org>, <degussa-gold-barren.shop>, <degussa-gold-barren.top>, <degussa-gold.gold>, <degussa-gold.kaufen>, <degussa-gold.top>, <degussa-goldbarren.biz>, <degussa-goldbarren.club>, <degussa-goldbarren.gmbh>, <degussa-goldbarren.gold>, <degussa-goldbarren.kaufen>, <degussa-goldbarren.org>, <degussa-goldbarren.top>, <degussa-goldhandel.investments>, <degussa-goldhandel.kaufen>, <degussa-goldhandel.top>, <degussa-goldladen.biz>, <degussa-goldladen.shop>, <degussa-goldladen.top>, <degussa-goldshop.club>, <degussa-goldshop.kaufen>, <degussa-goldshop.org>, <degussa-goldshop.top>, <degussa-handel.gold>, <degussa.investments>, <degussa.ws>, <gold-barren-degussa.investments>, <gold-barren-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-barren-degussa.shop>, <gold-barren-degussa.top>, <gold-handel-degussa.cc>, <gold-handel-degussa.club>, <gold-handel-degussa.investments>, <gold-handel-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-handel-degussa.top>, <handel-degussa.investments>, <handel-degussa.kaufen>, and <handel-degussa.top>, all registered on May 30, 2025; and <degussa.casa>, <degussa.cv>, <degussa.host>, <degussa.space>, and <degussa.tech> registered on May 31, 2025, resolve to pay-per-click (“PPC”) landing pages leading to third-party websites, including links related to the Complainant’s products and services.

## 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names <degussa.best>, <degussa.blog>, <degussa.casa>, <degussa.fit>, <degussa.help>, <degussa.icu>, <degussa.lat>, <degussa.plus>, <degussa.sbs>, <degussa.site>, <degussa.tech>, <degussa.cfd>, <degussa.cam>, <degussa.ink>, <degussa.direct>, <degussa.cv>, <degussa.host>, <degussa.space>, <degussa.investments>, <degussa.support>, and <degussa.ws> are identical to the trademark DEGUSSA in which the Complainant has rights as they reproduce the trademark in its entirety followed by the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".best", ".blog", ".casa", ".fit", ".help", ".icu", ".lat", ".plus", ".sbs", ".site", ".tech", ".cfd", ".cam", ".ink", ".direct", ".host", ".investments", ".support", and ".space", and the country-code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs") ".cv" and ".ws".

As to the disputed domain names combining the Complainant's mark with terms placed before or after the mark in the disputed domain names, namely <degussa-anlage.biz>, <degussa-anlage.club>, <degussa-anlage.org>, <degussa-anlage.shop>, <degussa-anlage.top>, <degussa-barren.biz>, <degussa-barren.investments>, <degussa-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-barren.top>, <degussa-gold-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-gold-barren.org>, <degussa-gold-barren.shop>, <degussa-gold-barren.top>, <degussa-gold.gold>, <degussa-gold.kaufen>, <degussa-gold.top>, <degussa-goldbarren.biz>, <degussa-goldbarren.club>, <degussa-goldbarren.gmbh>, <degussa-goldbarren.gold>, <degussa-goldbarren.kaufen>, <degussa-goldbarren.org>, <degussa-goldbarren.top>, <degussa-goldhandel.investments>, <degussa-goldhandel.kaufen>, <degussa-goldhandel.top>, <degussa-goldladen.biz>, <degussa-goldladen.shop>, <degussa-goldladen.top>, <degussa-goldshop.club>, <degussa-goldshop.kaufen>, <degussa-goldshop.org>, <degussa-goldshop.top>, <degussa-handel.gold>, <gold-barren-degussa.investments>, <gold-barren-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-barren-degussa.shop>, <gold-barren-degussa.top>, <gold-handel-degussa.cc>, <gold-handel-degussa.club>, <gold-handel-degussa.investments>, <gold-handel-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-handel-degussa.top>, <handel-degussa.investments>, <handel-degussa.kaufen>, <handel-degussa.top>, <degussa-goldhandel.best>, <degussa-goldhandel.club>, <degussa-goldhandel.digital>, <degussa-goldhandel.plus>, and <degussa-goldhandel.click>, the Complainant submits that they are all confusingly similar to the trademark DEGUSSA in which the Complainant has rights as they reproduce the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the descriptive terms "goldhandel", "anlage", "barren", "gold", "shop", "handel", and "laden", followed by the gTLDs ".best", ".club", ".digital", ".plus", ".click", ".biz", ".org", ".shop", ".top", ".investments", ".kaufen", ".gold", and ".gmbh", and the ccTLD ".cc".

The Complainant further contends that design elements in a complainant's trademark are generally disregarded when assessing confusing similarity and underlines that the added terms "gold", "barren", "kaufen", "anlage", "shop", and "handel" are generic descriptors of goods or services for which the Complainant is well known and their use reinforces the association with the Complainant.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, the Complainant states that: i) the Respondents are in no way licensed, affiliated or authorized by the Complainant to use its DEGUSSA trademark in any way; ii) the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names; and iii) the Respondents have never acquired or applied for any trademark registration for DEGUSSA or any variation thereof.

Moreover, the Complainant maintains that the Respondents are not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, since part of the registered domain names are being passively held, whilst the remaining disputed domain names all point to parking pages with PPC links, such use being purely commercial and designed to generate advertising revenue by capitalizing on the reputation of the Complainant's DEGUSSA mark.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that considering: i) the Complainant's reputation, long commercial use, and uniqueness of the DEGUSSA mark; ii) the DEGUSSA mark has a long-standing history dating back to the 19th century and the Complainant and its subsidiaries have used it as business identifier and trade mark for more than 40 years; and iii) the disputed domain names were all registered long after the Complainant acquired registered rights in the DEGUSSA mark, it is inconceivable that the Respondents registered a large number of disputed domain names consisting solely of the Complainant's mark without knowledge of the Complainant.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that in view of: i) the Respondents' bulk registration of the disputed domain names; ii) the Respondents' use of several disputed domain names for use in connection with PPC landing pages referring to investment products, precious metals, and other topics directly associated with the Complainant's field of business; iii) the Respondents' deliberate targeting of the Complainant's DEGUSSA trademark; and iv) the Respondents' registration of numerous other passively held disputed domain names, the Respondents not only clearly intended to target the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain, but also clearly engaged in a pattern of such conduct since it registered 72 disputed domain names incorporating the core of the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant further submits that there is no conceivable good-faith use of the disputed domain names and that the bulk registration of the disputed domain names comprising an identical reproduction of the Complainant's trademark is strong evidence of opportunistic bad faith.

## **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Complainant asserted that the disputed domain names, although registered in the name of different entities, are under common control since:

- i) The disputed domain names were registered through the same Registrar and privacy service;
- ii) The Respondents used a highly specific and uniform naming pattern for all disputed domain names;
- iii) The disputed domain names were registered using clustered registration dates;

iv) At the time of filing, the disputed domain names exhibited the same limited and uniform pattern of use: 19 of them were passively held (no active content), while the remaining 53 resolved to automatically generated PPC landing pages supplied by an advertising network, displaying sponsored links including links related to investment, precious metals and other topics connected to the Complainant's field of business;

v) There is an evident mismatch between registrant names and email addresses, as none of the disclosed email addresses corresponds to, or even resembles, the personal names of the nominal registrants.

The Panel finds that the elements highlighted by the Complainant and referenced above demonstrate a common control of the disputed domain names by the Respondents. Indeed, the disputed domain names, registered between April 17, 2025, and September 4, 2025, with the same Registrar, all incorporate the Complainant's trademark DEGUSSA, with the mere addition in some cases, of descriptive terms frequently related to the Complainant's field of business, and have been pointed either to parking pages with PPC links or to inactive websites.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

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.

Therefore, the Panel will now proceed to a decision on the merits of the case.

## **6.2. Substantive Issues**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall 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 directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain names registered by the Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for DEGUSSA (figurative mark).

As stated in section 1.10 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), "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".

The Panel finds that the textual component of the mark, consisting of "degussa", is entirely reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are either identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms “goldhandel” (“gold trade” in German), “anlage” (“investment” in German), “barren” (“bars” in German), “gold”, “goldbarren” (“gold bars” in German), “shop”, “handel” (“trade” in German), and “goldladen” (“gold store” in German) in 51 of the disputed domain names, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8

The applicable TLDs in the disputed domain names, such as the gTLDs “.best”, “.blog”, “.casa”, “.fit”, “.help”, “.icu”, “.lat”, “.plus”, “.sbs”, “.site”, “.tech”, “.cfid”, “.cam”, “.ink”, “.direct”, “.host”, “investments”, “.space”, “.club”, “.digital”, “.click”, “.biz”, “.org”, “.shop”, “.top”, “.kaufen”, “.gold”, “.support”, and “.gmbh”, and the ccTLDs “.cv”, “.ws”, and “.cc”, are viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview, section 1.11.

Therefore, 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, there is no evidence showing the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

The 19 disputed domain names <degussa.plus>, <degussa.support>, <degussa.best>, <degussa.blog>, <degussa.cfid>, <degussa.sbs>, <degussa.site>, <degussa.help>, <degussa.icu>, <degussa.lat>, <degussa.cam>, <degussa.fit>, <degussa.ink>, <degussa.direct> <degussa-goldhandel.best>, <degussa-goldhandel.club>, <degussa-goldhandel.digital>, <degussa-goldhandel.plus>, and <degussa-goldhandel.click> resolve to inactive websites. As held in *Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America v. Wrecks Communications Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0483](#), absent some contrary evidence from the Respondent, passive holding of a domain name does not constitute “legitimate noncommercial or fair use”.

The 53 disputed domain names <degussa-anlage.biz>, <degussa-anlage.club>, <degussa-anlage.org>, <degussa-anlage.shop>, <degussa-anlage.top>, <degussa-barren.biz>, <degussa-barren.investments>, <degussa-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-barren.top>, <degussa-gold-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-gold-barren.org>, <degussa-gold-barren.shop>, <degussa-gold-barren.top>, <degussa-gold.gold>, <degussa-gold.kaufen>, <degussa-gold.top>, <degussa-goldbarren.biz>, <degussa-goldbarren.club>, <degussa-goldbarren.gmbh>, <degussa-goldbarren.gold>, <degussa-goldbarren.kaufen>, <degussa-goldbarren.org>, <degussa-goldbarren.top>, <degussa-goldhandel.investments>, <degussa-goldhandel.kaufen>, <degussa-goldhandel.top>, <degussa-goldladen.biz>, <degussa-goldladen.shop>, <degussa-goldladen.top>, <degussa-goldshop.club>, <degussa-goldshop.kaufen>, <degussa-goldshop.org>, <degussa-goldshop.top>, <degussa-handel.gold>, <degussa.investments>, <degussa.ws>, <gold-barren-degussa.investments>, <gold-barren-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-barren-degussa.shop>, <gold-barren-degussa.top>, <gold-handel-degussa.cc>, <gold-handel-degussa.club>, <gold-handel-degussa.investments>, <gold-handel-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-handel-degussa.top>, <handel-degussa.investments>, <handel-degussa.kaufen>, <handel-degussa.top>, <degussa.casa>, <degussa.cv>, <degussa.host>, <degussa.space>, and <degussa.tech> resolve to PPC landing pages with sponsored links leading to third-party websites, including links related to the Complainant's products and services. The Panel finds that such use of the disputed domain names does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Indeed, panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

The Panel also finds that the disputed domain names, being identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark by combining the mark with terms which can be referred to the Complainant's business, are inherently misleading as they suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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, in view of the Complainant's prior registration and use of the trademark DEGUSSA in connection with its products and services, promoted online via the Complainant's website at "www.degussa.com", and considering the widely-known character of the mark in the precious metals industry, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The circumstance that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark by combine the mark with terms which can be referred to the Complainant's products and services suggests that the Respondent was indeed aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant's mark.

As indicated above, 53 disputed domain names resolve to PPC landing pages with links also related to the Complainant's field of business, which lead users to third-party websites. In view of such use of these disputed domain names, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its websites for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The remaining 19 disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness

and reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain names clearly targeting the Complainant, and considering i) the failure of the Respondent to submit a Response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, ii) the Respondent's concealing its identity in the public Whois records, and iii) the implausibility of any good-faith use to which the disputed domain names may be put, finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of these disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

## 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 <degussa-anlage.biz>, <degussa-anlage.club>, <degussa-anlage.org>, <degussa-anlage.shop>, <degussa-anlage.top>, <degussa-barren.biz>, <degussa-barren.investments>, <degussa-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-barren.top>, <degussa.best>, <degussa.blog>, <degussa.cam>, <degussa.casa>, <degussa.cfd>, <degussa.cv>, <degussa.direct>, <degussa.fit>, <degussa-goldbarren.biz>, <degussa-goldbarren.club>, <degussa-goldbarren.gmbh>, <degussa-goldbarren.gold>, <degussa-gold-barren.kaufen>, <degussa-goldbarren.kaufen>, <degussa-gold-barren.org>, <degussa-goldbarren.org>, <degussa-gold-barren.shop>, <degussa-gold-barren.top>, <degussa-goldbarren.top>, <degussa-gold.gold>, <degussa-goldhandel.best>, <degussa-goldhandel.click>, <degussa-goldhandel.club>, <degussa-goldhandel.digital>, <degussa-goldhandel.investments>, <degussa-goldhandel.kaufen>, <degussa-goldhandel.plus>, <degussa-goldhandel.top>, <degussa-gold.kaufen>, <degussa-goldladen.biz><degussa-goldladen.shop>, <degussa-goldladen.top>, <degussa-goldshop.club>, <degussa-goldshop.kaufen>, <degussa-goldshop.org>, <degussa-goldshop.top>, <degussa-gold.top>, <degussa-handel.gold>, <degussa.help>, <degussa.host>, <degussa.icu>, <degussa.ink>, <degussa.investments>, <degussa.lat>, <degussa.plus>, <degussa.sbs>, <degussa.site>, <degussa.space>, <degussa.support>, <degussa.tech>, <degussa.ws>, <gold-barren-degussa.investments>, <gold-barren-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-barren-degussa.shop>, <gold-barren-degussa.top>, <gold-handel-degussa.cc>, <gold-handel-degussa.club>, <gold-handel-degussa.investments>, <gold-handel-degussa.kaufen>, <gold-handel-degussa.top>, <handel-degussa.investments>, <handel-degussa.kaufen>, and <handel-degussa.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Luca Barbero/*

**Luca Barbero**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026