

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trekor Metals Limited v. IWS LTD

Case No. D2026-4234

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trekor Metals Limited, Canada, represented by McMillan LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is IWS LTD, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tasekomineslimited.com> is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 21, 2026. On September 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 22, 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 (Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 September 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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 corporation incorporated under the laws of British Columbia, Canada, with its head office in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. The Complainant was originally incorporated as Taseko Mines Limited on April 15, 1966, and traded under that name until June 24, 2026, when shareholders approved the change of the Company's name to Trekor Metals Limited, which name change became legally effective on June 25, 2026. The Complainant's shares have been traded under both the old and the new name on the Toronto Stock Exchange, London Stock Exchange and New York Stock Exchange.

An independent analysis of the Complainant's business by "Revelio Labs" shows the nature and substance of the Complainant, namely that it is an Energy and Resources company that employs 887 people worldwide as of March 2026, and is the tenth largest by headcount among its peers. From and after its registration on November 4, 2000, the Complainant used the domain name <tasekomines.com> for its official website. The said domain name featured on its official regulatory profiles and in typical official filings. A series of four archived screenshots of said site dating from between May 29, 2016, and January 4, 2026, show the Complainant's use of said site to promote its activities, in connection with which it refers to itself as "Taseko" and "Taseko Mines", including in connection with corporate news, such as litigation and financial reporting.

On March 6, 2026, the Complainant registered the domain name <trekormetals.com>, which it now uses for its official website. Its former domain name <tasekomines.com> redirects visitors to its new official online presence. The Complainant has referred to itself as "Taseko" or "Taseko Mines" on social media and has also been referred to as such in the mainstream media in news coverage, on a government press release and in the Težtan Biny Agreement dated July 23, 2025, between the Complainant and Tsilhqot'in Nation (evidence supplied). The Complainant has also used "Taseko" and/or "Taseko Mines" on community signage in the communities where it is active, in investor presentations, and in dedicated newsletters (evidence supplied).

The disputed domain name was registered on February 12, 2026. Little is known regarding the Respondent, which has not participated in the administrative proceeding, beyond the fact that it appears to be an entity with an address in the United Arab Emirates. A screenshot of the contact page on the website associated with the disputed domain name, produced by the Complainant, dated August 17, 2026, shows that this is headed "Taseko Mines" and features out-dated stock market pricing using three tickers which are assigned to the Complainant by the stock exchanges concerned. The said site replicates the textual content and look-and-feel displayed on the Complainant's former official website and features an "Investors" section that the Complainant says contains out of date public disclosures in respect of the Complainant. The contact page from said site uses the Complainant's correct official postal address, but the displayed telephone number and email address (the latter using the disputed domain name) do not belong to the Complainant. Following the Complainant contacting the relevant hosting company for the disputed domain name, on August 25, 2026, the said website was taken down and now displays a holding page which states, "We'll be back soon! Sorry for the inconvenience [...]".

The Complainant shows that a search conducted on Google dated August 26, 2026, for the term "taseko mines" returns the website associated with the disputed domain name as the first item, and the Complainant's official website as the second item. Both websites partly feature the same abstract, namely, "Taseko Mines [or Trekor Metals] is a dynamic and growing mining company focused on the operation and development of mines in North America". This indicates that the website associated with the disputed domain name has been indexed by Google and was appearing prominently in search results for the term "taseko mines".

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 it is the owner of two unregistered trademarks in Canada which contain the element TASEKO, namely TASEKO and TASEKO MINES and that its longstanding use and significant advertising and marketing of the said marks, along with its former trade name, Taseko Mines Limited, establish extensive common law rights in said trademarks.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its TASEKO and TASEKO MINES trademarks, as it incorporates them directly. It is therefore likely to confuse consumers into believing that the Respondent's website, accessed through the disputed domain name, is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant, or that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is authorized by the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's addition of the word "limited" to a string otherwise consisting of the Complainant's domain name <tasekomines.com> does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain name from that of the Complainant. Rather, it makes the disputed domain name identical to the entirety of the Complainant's former primary trade name.

Further, the Complainant notes that the Respondent's content on the website associated with the disputed domain name is intended to cause confusion, as the substantial similarity in appearance and function between the Respondent's website and the Complainant's website is deceptive and can reasonably be expected to mislead investors and members of the general public.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and there is no evidence that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant notes that the website associated with the disputed domain name does not offer any independent goods or services. Rather, it merely reproduces outdated information pertaining to the Complainant's business operations without authorization and the Complainant submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is to perform phishing and to appear to be the Complainant. Such use is not made for the purpose of a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is it a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent is not and has never been a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent ever been authorized to use, advertise or display any of the TASEKO and TASEKO MINES trademarks.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, it asserts that the Respondent used the disputed domain name in bad faith in order to attract users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the TASEKO and TASEKO MINES trademarks and the Complainant's former trade name. The website associated with the disputed domain name has mirrored, with certain discrete changes, the layout, appearance and manner of use of the Complainant's website, and accordingly the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name can only have the effect of confusing the public and depreciating the goodwill in the Complainant's trademark and trade name. The Complainant contends therefore that the Respondent has clearly registered the disputed domain name in bad faith in terms of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

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

The Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights in the marks TASEKO and TASEKO MINES. The Complainant also produces details of its application for a Canadian trademark for TASEKO MINES, although the Panel disregards this as it is still pending. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.4.

To establish unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the UDRP, the complainant must show that its mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the complainant's goods and/or services. Relevant evidence demonstrating such acquired distinctiveness (also referred to as secondary meaning) includes a range of factors such as (i) the duration and nature of the use of the mark (which may include social media presence and engagement), (ii) the amount of sales under the mark and during which time period, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark – including evidence of expenditures over a relevant time period, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry such as trade and professional associations, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

Here, the Complainant shows a substantial duration, and the nature of its use, of the mark TASEKO MINES, including the fact that it was the Complainant's former corporate name (along with the descriptor "Limited") from 1966 to 2026, and that it traded under such name for just over 60 years, applying this to its various mining activities and projects, including via on-site signage in the locations of its said activities. The Complainant also shows with historic screenshots dated 2021 and 2023 that the marks TASEKO and TASEKO MINES were prominently displayed on the Complainant's official website, using the domain name <tasekomines.com>, in association with its mining services. The Complainant also shows media recognition of its said marks both in mainstream media and community publications, and recognition on various prominent financial markets. Although the Complainant has recently renamed itself, it remains the owner of substantial goodwill in its former name, built up over a lengthy period, and further, continues to use its former official domain name <tasekomines.com> to redirect traffic to its new online location.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's rights in the claimed TASEKO MINES mark, which features over 60 years of use as a distinctive identifier of the Complainant and its services, are sufficient for the purposes of the Complainant's standing under the first element. In light of this finding, it is unnecessary for the Panel to determine whether the Complainant has separately established unregistered trademark rights in the mark TASEKO on its own.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

The Panel finds the mark TASEKO MINES 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](#), section 1.7.

The Panel notes that the broader case context, in particular, the appearance of the website associated with the disputed domain name (which has been designed to look like an official website of the Complainant using its former trade name, also featuring the Complainant's postal address but with amended telephone and email contact details), further supports a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's unregistered trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms, here, “limited”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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. Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making a bona fide offering of goods and services thereby. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant shows that the website associated with the disputed domain name adopts the Complainant’s former trade identity without authorization while substituting different contact details, which the Complainant notes is suggestive of possible phishing activity. The Complainant also states that the Respondent is not and has never been a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent ever been authorized to use, advertise or display any of the Complainant’s trademarks.

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.

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

No Response has been submitted by the Respondent in this administrative proceeding, nor is there any material before the Panel that could support a finding of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the absence of any such material, the Panel finds no indication, whether under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, that the Respondent possesses rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 has registered a domain name incorporating the Complainant's unregistered TASEKO MINES trademark and matching the Complainant's former corporate name (and key elements of its former official domain name, which is still in use). The accompanying use of the disputed domain name for a website reproducing the Complainant's branding, content and corporate address affirms that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its rights specifically in mind. The said website adopts the Complainant's former trade identity and principal corporate address without authorization while substituting different telephone and email contact details (the latter using the disputed domain name). The Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that this use is suggestive of phishing activity, or at least of preparations towards that end.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed phishing/identity theft, and/or 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.

As indicated in the preceding Section of this Decision, the Respondent did not take part in this administrative proceeding. Consequently, it has not replied to the Complainant's submissions or evidence, nor has it provided any evidence of its own, or any explanation capable of supporting a finding that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in good faith. Having considered the available record and in the absence of any contrary material from the Respondent, the Panel can identify no basis upon which it could be said that the disputed domain name was registered and used in good faith.

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 <tasekomineslimited.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: October 14, 2026