

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co v. chinda ray
Case No. D2025-2199

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is chinda ray, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dpdexport.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 5, 2025. On June 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 6, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 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 June 13, 2025.

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 June 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 8, 2025. The Respondent sent a one-word response consisting of the word “Hey” to the Center on July 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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

The Complainant, DPDgroup International Services GmbH, is one of Europe's leading domestic parcel delivery network with 57,000 delivery experts and a network of more than 108,000 Pickup points. The Complainant delivers over 5 million parcels each day, amounting to over 2 billion parcels per year.

The Complainant has an extensive global portfolio of trade mark registrations incorporating the DPD mark, including the following:

- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1217471 for DPD in Classes 9, 16, 35, 39, and 42, designating inter alia Australia, China, Israel, India, Japan, and United States of America, registered on March 28, 2014; and
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 761146 for DPD (figurative mark) in Classes 36 and 39, designating inter alia Australia, Japan, Singapore, Benelux Office for Intellectual Property, and Russian Federation, registered on May 26, 2001.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 9, 2025. The evidence provided by the Complainant further indicates that at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an active page which reproduces the Complainant's DPD and DPD (figurative) trademarks. At the time of issuance of this Decision, the disputed domain name continued to resolve to the same page.

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 registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's DPD trade marks and that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not affect the analysis as to whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade marks.

Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the additional term "export" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's DPD mark.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the DPD mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to the DPD mark, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name must be in bad faith.

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 a complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the DPD trade mark in multiple jurisdictions around the world. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Disregarding the gTLD ".com", the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark DPD in its entirety. Thus, the disputed domain name should be regarded as confusingly similar to the Complainant's DPD trade mark. The inclusion of the additional term "export" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, and 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the DPD trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade mark and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's distinctive trade mark (which also corresponds to the Complainant's company name) with the term "export", indicates the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of consumer confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant with respect to the origin of the website and a possible affiliation between it and the Complainant, and carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Respondent did not file a substantive response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Meanwhile, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the Respondent, prior to the notice of the dispute, had used or demonstrated its preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

There is also no evidence to show that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

As such, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing of the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that none of the circumstances of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy is applicable in this case.

Accordingly, and based on the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1).

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

When the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the DPD trade marks were already widely known and directly associated with the Complainant's activities. UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trade mark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Given the extensive prior use and fame of the Complainant's marks, in the Panel's view, the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant's marks when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's registered trade mark rights in DPD for its products and services predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. A simple online search for the term "dpd" would have revealed that it is an established brand. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The Respondent has not presented any evidence or explanation to justify its choice of the terms “dpd” and “export” in the disputed domain name. Considering that the term “export” is directly related to the Complainant’s business the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent’s selection of the term “export” in combination with the Complainant’s trade mark is coincidental.

The Panel is therefore of the view that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s trade mark rights.

Moreover, the Complainant has provided evidence that the Respondent, without authorization, used the disputed domain name to imitate the Complainant’s website. UDRP panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name to for impersonation constitutes use in bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4). Upon review of the record, the Panel finds that both the registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <dpdexport.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: July 30, 2025