

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Degussa Holding AG v. Daniel Schuller
Case No. D2025-4808

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Daniel Schuller, Germany.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <degussa.ag>, <degussa-anlage.cc>, <degussa-anlage.com>, <degussa-anlage.net>, <degussa-barren.cc>, <degussa-barren.com>, <degussa-barren.shop>, <degussa.cash>, <degussa.ceo>, <degussa.city>, <degussa.credit>, <degussa.email>, <degussa.enterprises>, <degussa.exchange>, <degussa.express>, <degussa.finance>, <degussa.gmbh>, <degussa-gold-barren.cc>, <degussa-goldbarren.cc>, <degussa-gold-barren.com>, <degussa-gold-barren.net>, <degussa-goldbarren.net>, <degussa-gold-barren.online>, <degussa-goldbarren.online>, <degussa-goldbarren.shop>, <degussa-goldbarren.vip>, <degussa-goldbarren.website>, <degussa-goldhandel.ag>, <degussa-goldhandel.lc>, <degussa-goldhandel.vip>, <degussa-goldhandel.ws>, <degussa-goldladen.cc>, <degussa-goldladen.com>, <degussa-goldladen.net>, <degussa-gold.shop>, <degussa-goldshop.cc>, <degussa-goldshop.net>, <degussa-goldshop.online>, <degussa-goldshop.shop>, <degussa.haus>, <degussa.international>, <degussa.lc>, <degussa.llc>, <degussa.mobi>, <degussa.money>, <degussa.promo>, <degussa.run>, <degussa.social>, <degussa.solutions>, <degussa.tax>, <degussa.tel>, <degussa.today>, <degussa.watch>, <degussa.work>, <degussa.works>, <degussa.zone>, <gold-barren-degussa.cc>, <gold-barren-degussa.com>, <gold-handel-degussa.com>, <goldhandel-degussa.com>, <gold-handel-degussa.shop>, <handel-degussa.cc> and <handel-degussa.com> is 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 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 19, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, See

PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 20, 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 the same date.

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 November 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on December 18, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Swiss stock corporation dating back to the 19th century. The Complainant, either directly or through its operating subsidiaries and licensees, oversees commercial activities, such as production and distribution of investment-grade precious metal bars and coins, operation of a network of retail stores and showrooms offering bullion products and related services in major European cities, provision of secure 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 holds and licenses a portfolio of trademarks for the mark DEGUSSA in numerous jurisdictions, such as European Union ("EU") Trademark Registration (figurative) No. 008749012 (registered on May 20, 2010) and International Trademark (figurative) number 1262010 (registered on April 23, 2015). The Degussa Group includes several subsidiaries, such as Degussa Goldhandel GmbH (Germany) and Degussa Goldhandel AG (Switzerland). In total, the Degussa Group operates more than a dozen retail locations and showrooms and has a strong customer base throughout Europe. The Complainant operates its website at the domain name <degussa-goldhandel.de> and uses various other domain names such as <degussa.com>, <degussa.eu>, <degussa-goldhandel.com> and <degussa-goldhandel.net> to redirect there. The Complainant has social-media presence.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names on May 30 and May 31, 2025. The Complainant documents that the disputed domain names redirect to websites that display a series of advertising links that lead to third-party websites. Many of these links refer to topics and commercial areas connected to the Complainant's products and services.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Based on the public available registrant information, the Complainant argued consolidation of disputes against multiple domain name registrants in a single complaint. As the Registrar has confirmed that all disputed domain names are registered by the same person, the Respondent, it is not necessary for the Panel to analyze this further.

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that 28 of the disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant's trademark. As for the remaining 35 disputed domain names, they

combine the Complainant's trademark with descriptive or generic German terms such as "goldhandel" ("gold trade"), "gold-barren" ("gold bars"), "barren" ("bars"), "goldshop", "goldladen" ("gold shop"), and "anlage" ("investment"). The added terms reinforce — rather than dispel — the association with the Complainant, especially since DEGUSSA is well known in the field of precious metals and gold trading.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and targeted the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain names, which establishes bad faith registration. Moreover, the composition of the disputed names and the use of them prove targeting of the Complainant in opportunistic bad faith. The Respondent's use generates click-through revenue. Moreover, there is no plausible good-faith explanation for registering the disputed domain names and using them for monetized advertising. The Respondent has sought to benefit from confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in DEGUSSA. 28 of the disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant's trademark. The remaining 35 disputed domain names combine the Complainant's trademark with the terms such as "goldhandel" (in English "gold trade"), "gold-barren" ("gold bars"), "barren" ("bars"), "goldshop", "goldladen" ("gold shop"), "handel" and "anlage" ("investment"). The additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7. and 1.8.

For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the Top-Level Domains. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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. While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds 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 showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names or names corresponding to the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent has used the inherently misleading disputed domain names to direct to webpages with pay-per-click advertising links.

Based on the available record, 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.

The incorporation of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain names together with the terms associated with the Complainant's business and the Complainant's prior rights and fame, prove on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the disputed domain names. The use of the inherently misleading disputed domain names to generate click-through revenue is under the circumstances evidence of bad faith use. The Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The third element of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the disputed domain names <degussa.ag>, <degussa-anlage.cc>, <degussa-anlage.com>, <degussa-anlage.net>, <degussa-barren.cc>, <degussa-barren.com>, <degussa-barren.shop>, <degussa.cash>, <degussa.ceo>, <degussa.city>, <degussa.credit>, <degussa.email>, <degussa.enterprises>, <degussa.exchange>, <degussa.express>, <degussa.finance>, <degussa.gmbh>, <degussa-gold-barren.cc>, <degussa-goldbarren.cc>, <degussa-gold-barren.com>, <degussa-gold-barren.net>, <degussa-goldbarren.net>, <degussa-gold-barren.online>, <degussa-goldbarren.online>, <degussa-goldbarren.shop>, <degussa-goldbarren.vip>, <degussa-goldbarren.website>, <degussa-goldhandel.ag>, <degussa-goldhandel.lc>, <degussa-goldhandel.vip>, <degussa-goldhandel.ws>, <degussa-goldladen.cc>, <degussa-goldladen.com>, <degussa-goldladen.net>, <degussa-gold.shop>, <degussa-goldshop.cc>, <degussa-goldshop.net>, <degussa-goldshop.online>, <degussa-goldshop.shop>, <degussa.haus>, <degussa.international>, <degussa.lc>, <degussa.llc>, <degussa.mobi>, <degussa.money>, <degussa.promo>, <degussa.run>, <degussa.social>, <degussa.solutions>, <degussa.tax>, <degussa.tel>, <degussa.today>, <degussa.watch>, <degussa.work>, <degussa.works>, <degussa.zone>, <gold-barren-degussa.cc>, <gold-barren-degussa.com>, <gold-handel-degussa.com>, <goldhandel-degussa.com>, <gold-handel-degussa.shop>, <handel-degussa.cc> and <handel-degussa.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: December 26, 2025