

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. KG v. Paul Brindley Case No. D2025-1701

1. The Parties

1.1 The Complainant is DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Fidal, France.

1.2 The Respondent is Paul Brindley, Latvia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

2.1 The disputed domain name <dpdinpost.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 28, 2025. At that time, publicly available Whois details did not identify the underlying registrant of the Domain Name.

3.2 On April 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 30, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing underlying registrant and contact information for the Domain Name. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on April 30, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 2, 2025.

3.3 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”).

3.4 In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 27, 2025.

3.5 The Center appointed Matthew S. Harris as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 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 by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

4.1 The Complainant forms part of the DPD group of companies. Although the Complainant describes itself in the Complainant as “DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co”, the Panel understands that full name of the Complainant to be “DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. KG”. In this respect the Panel notes that (a) this was the name give for the complainant in *DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. KG. v. Host Master, 1337 Services LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0510](#), *DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. KG v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Debra Hutson*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0324](#) and *DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. KG v. Mike Ross*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3646](#), and (b) that the complainant in those previous proceedings was represented by the same law firm that represents the Complainant in this case.

4.2 The DPD group delivers 2.1 billion parcels per year, with pick up points in 230 different countries. Its turnover in 2023 was Euros 15.7 billion.

4.3 Companies within the DPD group are the registered owners of a portfolio of various trade marks that incorporate in some form of another the term “DPD”. The Complainant specifically relies upon three registered trade mark, all of which are registered in the name of DPDgroup International Services GmbH. They are as follows:

(i) International trade mark no 761146 registered on May 26, 2001 in classes 36 and 39 and which takes the following form:



This mark is based upon an earlier European Union trade mark and has proceeded to registration in approximately 50 jurisdictions.

(ii) International trade mark no 1217471 registered on March 28, 2014 in classes 9, 16, 35, 39 and 42 and which takes the following form:



This mark is based upon an earlier European Union trade mark and has proceeded to registration in excess of 50 jurisdictions.

(iii) International trade mark no 1271522 registered on August 25, 2015 in class 39 and which takes the following form:



This mark is based upon an earlier German trade mark and has proceeded to registration more than 50 jurisdictions.

4.4 The DPD group’s activities are promoted from a website operating from the <dpd.com> domain name.

4.5 The Domain Name was registered on February 27, 2025. According to the contact details provided by the Registrar, the Respondent appears to be an individual located in Latvia.

4.6 The Domain Name has been used since registration for a website that offers shipping services, both nationally and globally under the name "DPD Inpost". That website provides a United Kingdom contact telephone number but provides an office address in Sandhurst, Sandton, South Africa. A map is also provided for that address, and that map identifies that office as belonging to an entity using the name "PostNet".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. At one point it contends that the Domain Name is similar to its marks, but at another it claims that it is "identical to the Complainant's trademarks, company name and domain name rights". It describes the way in which the Domain Name has been used, and contends that the website is "completely fraudulent" and that "fraudulent acts have already been observed". However, in what way the website is "fraudulent" is not really explained.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 In places the Complaint has not been prepared with the care that it could have been. The Panel has already mentioned the fact that the full name of the Complainant is not identified in the Complaint, and the failure properly to identify the alleged fraudulent nature of the website operating from the Domain Name.

6.2 So far as the first element of the Policy is concerned, the Complainant lists a series of trade marks, some of which are registered in names similar to, but not the same as, the Complainant. In this respect the Panel has already observed that the three trade marks primarily relied upon by the Complainant are registered in the name of DPDgroup International Services GmbH. However, no attempt is made in the Complaint to explain the basis upon the Complainant claims rights in those marks, notwithstanding that they appear on their face to be registered in the name of a different entity.

6.3 However, best the Panel can tell this a "GmbH & Co. KG" is a German legal form that combines the advantages of a limited liability company (GmbH) and a limited partnership (Kommanditgesellschaft, KG), whereby the GmbH acts as the general partner in a KG. The Panel further understands that a GmbH & Co. KG comprises two separate legal entities: the GmbH (the general partner) and the KG (the limited partnership).

6.4 Further, regardless of whether this is correct, there seems little doubt that the Complainant and the entities in whose name the relevant marks are registered, all form part of the same group all of which use to some degree or other the relevant marks. The Panel also observes in this respect that the legal representative recorded on the register in respect of the marks relied upon, is the same as the legal representative of the Complainant in these proceedings.

6.5 Given this the Panel is satisfied, without the need to seek further clarification or confirmation from the Complainant, that the Complainant has rights in the trade marks relied upon, even if it is not the registered

owner of those marks; see also the summary of the position where a complainant asserts rights in a mark registered in the name of a subsidiary or parent to be found at section 1.4 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)).

6.6 It is generally 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 trade mark in which the complainant claims rights and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

6.7 Contrary to what the Complainant at one point contends, the Domain Name is not identical to the trade marks that the Complainant relies upon. Nevertheless, the Panel does accept that the Domain Name and the relevant marks are confusingly similar. In this respect, at least significant part of all the marks relied upon are the letters “dpd” and in the case of one of those marks, the mark takes the form of these letters alone in stylised text.

6.8 The Panel, therefore, finds these marks are recognisable within the Domain Name. This is sufficient for a finding that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to these marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

6.9 Although the addition of other terms (in this case the text “inpost”), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition text in this case does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

6.10 The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests and Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.11 It is usual for panels under the Policy to consider the issues of rights or legitimate interests and registration and use in bad faith in turn. However, in this case it is more convenient to consider those issues together. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.15.

6.12 The Domain Name in this case can most sensibly be read as a combination of the DPD mark and name used by the Complainant and the words “inpost” or “in post”. “Post” is obviously a word that is frequently used to indicate a postal service, and as such is a word that is at least in part descriptive of the services provided by the Complainant’s group. The Panel also is aware (although, once again this is unhelpfully not mentioned in the Complainant) that “InPost” is the name of a third party parcel delivery and remote locker service. Given this, and given the extent of the business of the Complainant’s group, the Panel is satisfied that internet users will read the Domain Name as referring to the Complainant’s business and mark.

6.13 Further, the Panel is satisfied that this was the deliberate intention of the Respondent. The Panel is satisfied that this is the case on the basis of the make-up of the Domain Name alone, but any doubt in this respect is removed when one considers the website operating from the Domain Name. That website offers services similar to that of the Complainant, and the Panel is satisfied that any person or entity offering such services would have adopted and used that name with knowledge of the Complainant’s business.

6.14 In the circumstances, the Panel finds that even if the website operating from the Domain Name is being used in respect of a genuine business, the Domain Name impermissibly and deliberately impersonates the business of the DPD group, and that has been done to take unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant’s DPD marks.

6.15 There is no right or legitimate interest in holding and using a domain name to deliberately mislead Internet users into believing that the domain name is held and being used by a trade mark owner when it is not ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1) and such holding and use provides positive evidence that no such

rights or legitimate interest exists. The registration and use of a domain name for such a purpose is also registration and use in bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4). Further and in any event, the Respondent's operation of the website from the Domain Name also falls within the circumstances evidencing bad faith registration and use set out at paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

6.16 The Complainant's contention that the website is "fraudulent" is, however, problematic. That is a serious allegation and it requires at the very least some form of explanation. It is also language that would ordinarily be understood as suggesting activity that goes beyond merely the adoption for a genuine business of a name that is similar to the mark of another (even if that activity involves unlawful infringement).

6.17 There are aspects of the website operating from the Domain Name, that are suggestive that the website operating from the business is not a genuine one and that this is being used to further some form of fraud. They include, (i) the curious combination of a United Kingdom phone number, an address in South Africa and Domain Name registration details associated with an address in Latvia, (ii) content on the website that has clearly been designed to suggest to Internet users that this is a very considerable business, but that which appears to be at odds with the "PostNet" business identified in the map appearing on the website, and (iii) the failure to identify on the website the legal entity or person operating the website and associated claimed business. But the problem is that no such contention is coherently advanced by the Complainant. However, given the Panel's findings as to the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests and bad faith even in the absence of any sort of fraud, there is no need to consider this issue further.

6.18 The Panel, therefore, finds that the Complainant has established the second and third elements of the Policy.

7. Decision

7.1 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 <dpdinpost.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew S. Harris/

Matthew S. Harris

Sole Panelist

Date: June 7, 2025