

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Laboratorios Rivas S.R.L v. Golden Rewards
Case No. D2026-2626

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Laboratorios Rivas S.R.L, Dominican Republic, represented by Salusse, Marangoni, Parente e Jabur Advogados, Brazil.

The Respondent is Golden Rewards, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <silicon-mix.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 16, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 18, 2026, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not file any amendment to the Complaint. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 22, 2026, suggesting it would defend the proceedings as it had a legitimate business reason for registering the disputed domain name.

The Center verified that the 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 July 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal Response or give any further details or evidence after the commencement of the proceedings.

The Center appointed Dawn Osborne as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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, a manufacturer of hair care and cosmetic products, is the owner of the mark SILICON MIX (plus design) registered, inter alia, as trade mark number 3459453 in the United States for hair care products since July 1, 2008, without any disclaimer. The Complainant owns the domain name <siliconmix.com>.

The disputed domain name registered on October 5, 2025, is being used for a site using the Complainant's exact trade mark with design as a masthead and purportedly offering the Complainant's products for sale. The website contains a copyright notice "© 2026, Silicon Mix B2B Wholesale Partnership".

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:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the distinctive word elements of the Complainant's prior mark merely adding a hyphen and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") .com.

The Respondent does not have any rights in the disputed domain name and has not been authorised by the Complainant to use the Complainant's mark.

The disputed domain name points to a website impersonating the Complainant using the Complainant's exact registered trade mark in its logo form as a masthead to purport to offer the Complainant's goods. Security warnings on an Internet security site suggest that the site attached to the disputed domain name may be a scam site. This is not a bona fide offering of services or a noncommercial legitimate fair use. It is registration and use in bad faith causing confusion for commercial gain in full knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The physical address given by the Respondent has been used for another site that appears to be impersonating another third party body and hair care brand with an identically constructed website using the third party brand's logo as a masthead and confusing wording, and using the third party's word mark as the domain name for that site merely adding a hyphen and a gTLD.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On June 22, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center. In that email, the Respondent stated that it was the registered owner of the disputed domain name and that it had acquired the disputed domain name in good faith for brand and business development purposes. The Respondent further stated that it objected to the Complainant's claims and intended to defend its rights in the disputed domain name. It requested a copy of the formal Complaint and related details in order to prepare and submit a comprehensive response.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the word element of the mark which is not disclaimed is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.10. The addition of a hyphen as mere punctuation does not prevent this confusing similarity.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or authorised by the Complainant. The Respondent is impersonating the Complainant by using the disputed domain name for a website using the Complainant's identical registered trade mark with its design elements as a masthead and confusing wording which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant. As such the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract for commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, thereby disrupting the Complainant's business. The Panel also notes that there is some evidence that the Respondent is also impersonating a third party body and hair care brand, in a very similar way suggesting a pattern of bad faith activity.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 <silicon-mix.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dawn Osborne/

Dawn Osborne

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026