

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Degussa Holding AG v. Jacob Simmons, FreshHarvest Foods, Sophia Morgan, Elevate Fitness Studio, Chloe Ramirez, MetroLink Supplies, Ethan Ward, PureGlow Cosmetics, Victoria Price, Vertex Energy Systems, Lauren Phillips, ApexShield Security, Nathan Foster, SkyBridge Travel, Tyler Adams, GoldenLeaf Organics, Olivia Bennett, Christopher Hall, SilverOak Consulting, Steven Clark, Michael Carter, Ryan Cooper, Michael Carter, Amanda Scott, Daniel Brooks, Sophia Morgan, MetroLink Supplies, Steven Clark, Andrew Lewis
Case No. D2026-3066

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Jacob Simmons, FreshHarvest Foods, Sophia Morgan, Elevate Fitness Studio, Chloe Ramirez, MetroLink Supplies, Ethan Ward, PureGlow Cosmetics, Victoria Price, Vertex Energy Systems, Lauren Phillips, ApexShield Security, Nathan Foster, SkyBridge Travel, Tyler Adams, GoldenLeaf Organics, Olivia Bennett, Christopher Hall, SilverOak Consulting, Steven Clark, Michael Carter, Ryan Cooper, Amanda Scott, Daniel Brooks, Sophia Morgan, MetroLink Supplies, Steven Clark, Andrew Lewis, United States of America ("United States"); and Michael Carter, Germany. ¹

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <degussa-goldankauf.com>, <degussa-goldankauf.online>, <degussa-gold.art>, <degussa-gold.cc>, <degussa-gold.click>, <degussa-gold.help>, <degussa-gold.net>, <degussa-gold.one>, <degussa-gold.sbs>, <degussa-gold.wiki>, <degussa-online.cc>, <degussa-online.help>, <degussa-online.one>, <degussaonline.one>, <degussa-online.wiki>, <degussa-web.art>, <degussa-web.click>, <degussa-web.com>, <degussa-web.help>, <degussa-web.one>, <degussa-webonline.online>, <degussa-web.sbs> and <degussa-web.wiki> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

¹ Some of the Respondents' names are duplicated in this list where they have different contact addresses for different disputed domain names.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 13, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (See PrivacyGuardian.org, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 15, 2026 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 16, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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 oversees a broad range of commercial activities related to precious metals, including gold. It is the parent and coordinating entity of the Degussa Group, the name of which was derived from “Deutsche Gold- und Silber-Scheideanstalt” (meaning “German Gold and Silver Refinery”). The Complainant holds trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration number 008749012 for DEGUSSA, registered on May 20, 2010, for goods in classes 14, and 36; and
- International trademark registration number 1249667 for a figurative DEGUSSA mark (the “Degussa logo”), registered on April 16, 2015, for goods and services in classes 14 and 36.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant uses the domain name <degussa-goldhandel.de> in connection with its German website, which prominently displays the Degussa logo, provides information about the Complainant, and offers its precious metals for sale. The Complainant has registered other Degussa-formative domain names that redirect to this website. The Complainant’s subsidiaries operate Degussa accounts on various social media platforms.

The Respondents are named as various individuals and businesses with contact street addresses in the United States, and one who also has a contact address in Germany. Of these, 17 contact email addresses use the same Russian email service provider, while four use the same German email service provider.

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown below:

Date of registration	Disputed domain name	Name of registrant
May 27, 2026	<degussa-goldankauf.com>	Olivia Bennett
June 17, 2026	<degussa-goldankauf.online>	Christopher Hall, SilverOak Consulting
June 19, 2026	<degussa-webonline.online>	Sophia Morgan, MetroLink Supplies
June 22, 2026	<degussa-gold.art>	Jacob Simmons, FreshHarvest Foods
June 22, 2026	<degussa-gold.cc>	Sophia Morgan, Elevate Fitness Studio
June 22, 2026	<degussa-gold.click>	Chloe Ramirez, MetroLink Supplies
June 22, 2026	<degussa-gold.help>	Ethan Ward, PureGlow Cosmetics
June 22, 2026	<degussa-gold.net>	Victoria Price, Vertex Energy Systems
June 22, 2026	<degussa-gold.one>	Lauren Phillips, ApexShield Security
June 22, 2026	<degussa-gold.sbs>	Nathan Foster, SkyBridge Travel
June 22, 2026	<degussa-gold.wiki>	Tyler Adams, GoldenLeaf Organics
June 23, 2026	<degussa-web.art>	Michael Carter
June 23, 2026	<degussa-web.help>	Michael Carter
June 23, 2026	<degussa-web.one>	Christopher Hall
June 24, 2026	<degussa-web.click>	Ryan Cooper
June 24, 2026	<degussa-web.sbs>	Amanda Scott
June 24, 2026	<degussa-web.wiki>	Daniel Brooks
June 25, 2026	<degussa-online.cc>	Steven Clark
June 25, 2026	<degussa-online.help>	Steven Clark
June 25, 2026	<degussa-online.one>	Steven Clark
June 25, 2026	<degussaonline.one>	Steven Clark
June 25, 2026	<degussa-online.wiki>	Steven Clark
June 28, 2026	<degussa-web.com>	Andrew Lewis

On July 2, 2026, the Complainant's representative requested that the Registrar suspend 18 disputed domain names plus two other Degussa-formative domain names.

According to evidence presented by the Complainant, 18 disputed domain names (<degussa-gold.art>, <degussa-gold.cc>, <degussa-gold.click>, <degussa-gold.one>, <degussa-gold.wiki>, <degussa-goldankauf.online>, <degussa-online.help>, <degussa-online.one>, <degussa-online.wiki>, <degussa-web.art>, <degussa-web.click>, <degussa-web.help>, <degussa-web.one>, <degussa-web.sbs>, <degussa-web.wiki>, <degussaonline.one>, <degussa-web.com>, and <degussa-online.cc>) resolve to websites in German that prominently display the DEGUSSA logo and offer DEGUSSA-branded precious metals for sale. The websites give the impression that the Complainant is their operator. The contact details on the websites include a generic email address that uses the suffix associated with the disputed domain name <degussa-webonline.online>.

At the time when the Complaint was filed, five disputed domain names (<degussa-goldankauf.com>, <degussa-webonline.online>, <degussa-gold.help>, <degussa-gold.net>, and <degussa-gold.sbs>), did not resolve to any active websites; rather, they are passively held.

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 are confusingly similar to its DEGUSSA mark.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not licensees of the Complainant and not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondents to make use of its DEGUSSA trademark, in a domain name or otherwise. The Respondents are using, or have used, the disputed domain names for fraudulent fake shop websites impersonating the Complainant.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondents' knowledge and targeting of the Complainant is beyond doubt: the fake shop websites used the DEGUSSA sign, displayed gold bars and coins, copied the look and feel of an official DEGUSSA online shop, used German-language sales content and prices in EUR, and offered precisely the goods for which the Complainant is known. Certain disputed domain names are presently suspended, on registrar hold, or returning "timed out" messages following notifications of abuse and takedown procedures. In any case, the current passive holding of these disputed domain names form a coordinated pattern of cybersquatting.

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 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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that all disputed domain names were registered within approximately one month of each other with the same Registrar, following a naming pattern that begins with "degussa". Of these, 18 disputed domain names resolve to identical or substantially identical websites with identical contact data. The other five disputed domain names are passively held, but one of them (<degussa-webonline.online>) is used in a generic contact email address on the websites associated with the actively-used disputed domain names and shares the individual registrant name for one of those actively-used disputed domain names (<degussa-gold.cc>), while the other four are identical to one or more of the actively-used disputed domain names, but for their respective Top-Level Domain ("TLD") extensions. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds it likely that the disputed domain names are all under common control.

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.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (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.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a DEGUSSA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

All disputed domain names incorporate the DEGUSSA mark in its entirety and as their respective initial element. Despite the addition of one or more terms (variously "ankauf" [meaning "purchase"], "gold", "online", and "web") and, in some cases, a hyphen, the DEGUSSA mark remains clearly recognizable within all disputed domain names. The only other element in each disputed domain name is a TLD extension (variously ".art", ".cc", ".click", ".com", ".help", ".net", ".one", ".online", ".sbs", or ".wiki") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds all the disputed domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's DEGUSSA mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

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 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, all the disputed domain names incorporate the DEGUSSA mark, ten of them combining that mark with the word "gold", which describes one of the Complainant's products, while seven combine that mark with the word "web", five with the word "online" and one with both "web" and "online", which connote the Internet. These combinations all carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Eighteen disputed domain names actively resolve to websites that impersonate the Complainant and offer precious metals for sale. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for

illegitimate activity here, such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. The other five disputed domain names are passively held. These circumstances do not indicate that the Respondent is using any of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor that it is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names for the purposes of the Policy.

Further, the Respondent is identified in the Registrar's database by the names shown in the table in Section 4 *supra*, none of which resembles any of the disputed domain names. Nothing on the record shows that the Respondent has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names.

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 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.

Based on the 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 fourth of these is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2026, years after the registration of the Complainant's DEGUSSA mark. That mark is not a dictionary term, yet all the disputed domain names incorporate it as their respective initial element. Eighteen disputed domain names resolve to websites that impersonate the Complainant, while another (<degussa-webonline.online>) is used in a generic contact email address on those websites. The remaining four disputed domain names combine the mark with the word "gold", indicating an awareness of the Complainant's business. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its DEGUSSA mark at the time when it registered the disputed domain names.

As regards use, 18 disputed domain names resolve to active websites that impersonate the Complainant, offering precious metals for sale. Prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as passing off, constitutes bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Although the other five disputed domain names do not resolve to any active website, prior UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the similarities in the timing and composition of the passively-held disputed domain names and those that are actively used in bad faith, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of five disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of all the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, 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 names <degussa-goldankauf.com>, <degussa-goldankauf.online>, <degussa-gold.art>, <degussa-gold.cc>, <degussa-gold.click>, <degussa-gold.help>, <degussa-gold.net>, <degussa-gold.one>, <degussa-gold.sbs>, <degussa-gold.wiki>, <degussa-online.cc>, <degussa-online.help>, <degussa-online.one>, <degussaonline.one>, <degussa-online.wiki>, <degussa-web.art>, <degussa-web.click>, <degussa-web.com>, <degussa-web.help>, <degussa-web.one>, <degussa-webonline.online>, <degussa-web.sbs> and <degussa-web.wiki> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: August 21, 2026