

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alamos Gold Inc. v. Sophik, Sophik
Case No. D2026-2855

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alamos Gold Inc., Canada, represented by Dickinson Wright LLP, Canada.

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

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alamos-gold.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 30, 2026. On July 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 2, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 2, 2026, 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 July 2, 2026.

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 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 response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Alfred Meijboom as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 Canadian-based gold producer, which owns several trademark registrations, including:

- Canadian trademark ALAMOS GOLD with registration number TMA951662 of October 6, 2016, for services in classes 35, 36, 37, 40 and 42;
- United States trademark ALAMOS GOLD with registration number 5225718 of June 20, 2017, for services in classes 35, 36, 37, 40 and 42; and
- United States trademark  ALAMOS GOLD with registration number 7215569 of November 14, 2023, for services in classes 35, 36, 37, 40 and 42

In addition, the Complainant maintains its official Internet presence through the domain name <alamosgold.com> and displays the logo  (the “checkmark logo”) on its website under the aforementioned domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 23, 2026, and resolves to a website which features the checkmark logo. The website presents a login page and invites Internet users to sign up or sign in using email or phone credentials. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is being used in connection with an apparent cryptocurrency or online investment scheme, which allegedly has been promoted through social media, including Facebook.

Before filing the Complaint, the Complainant submitted abuse reports to the Registrar and other services providers on June 1, 2026. The Registrar stated that it had forwarded the Complainant’s report to the website operator. However, the disputed domain name remained active.

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 Complainant’s ALAMOS GOLD trademark is immediately recognizable in the disputed domain name, the only difference being the hyphen between “alamos” and “gold”, which is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant further alleges that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s official domain name <alamosgold.com>, from which it differs only by that hyphen. According to the Complainant, this is a clear typographical variation designed to take advantage of Internet users seeking, or expecting to find, the Complainant.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant’s ALAMOS GOLD trademark, the “Alamos” name, the Complainant’s checkmark logo, or any domain name incorporating or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, because it resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant and invites Internet users to create accounts or enter login credentials. The Complainant submits that such impersonation, a copycat login page, public confusion, and an apparent cryptocurrency or investment scheme cannot establish rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent had the Complainant and its trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is not a coincidental dictionary phrase or descriptive expression, but rather a deliberate imitation of the Complainant’s trademark and official domain

name, differing from the latter only by a hyphen. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent subsequently used the disputed domain name for a website displaying the Complainant's name and the Complainant's checkmark logo.

The Complainant further alleges that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith because the associated website uses the Complainant's trademarks and is being used for an apparent cryptocurrency or online investment scheme, allegedly promoted through social media, and because the use has continued despite abuse reports to the Registrar and relevant service providers.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Respondent did not file a Response. However, as set out in section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), the consensus view of UDRP panels is that the respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. The Complainant must still establish each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Although the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default, paragraph 4 of the Policy requires the Complainant to support its assertions with actual evidence in order to succeed in this proceeding. Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the panel shall draw such inferences as it considers appropriate from a failure of a party to comply with a provision or requirement of the Rules. The Panel finds that in this case there are no such exceptional circumstances.

Under the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's ALAMOS GOLD trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Respondent has taken the ALAMOS GOLD trademark in its entirety and placed a hyphen between the two elements, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the ALAMOS GOLD trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

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 3.1](#), 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.

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain name has been used to resolve to a website that attempts to impersonate the Complainant by featuring the Complainant’s ALAMOS GOLD trademark and the Complainant’s checkmark logo. The website requires Internet users to register their details and to log in, allegedly as part of a cryptocurrency or online investment scheme promoted on social media. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s allegation that this scheme is likely fraudulent, and the Panel sees no plausible basis on which such use of the Complainant’s marks in connection with the associated cryptocurrency or online investment scheme could constitute legitimate activity. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for unlawful activities, such as a copycat site and investment scheme, 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 is satisfied that the Respondent must have had the Complainant’s ALAMOS GOLD trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The ALAMOS GOLD trademark was registered about a decade before the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name is nearly identical to both the Complainant’s ALAMOS GOLD trademark and the domain name associated with the Complainant’s main website. The term “alamos-gold” is not an obvious independent choice, as it is neither a dictionary term nor a descriptive concept. Furthermore, the fact that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant’s ALAMOS GOLD trademark and the Complainant’s checkmark logo, and that the Respondent’s website is hence likely being used as part of an advertised cryptocurrency or online investment scheme, is a clear indication that the disputed domain name was deliberately chosen with reference to the Complainant’s ALAMOS GOLD trademark. Under these circumstances, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible explanation as to why the Respondent would have been unaware of the Complainant and its ALAMOS GOLD trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

As it remains undisputed that the disputed domain name is being used as part of illegitimate activities, such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Complainant has shown that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds 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 that the disputed domain name <alamos-gold.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alfred Meijboom/
Alfred Meijboom
Sole Panelist
Date: July 24, 2026