

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co v. Suhel Ahmed  
Case No. D2025-2751

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Suhel Ahmed, United Kingdom.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <dpdexpresss.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 11, 2025. On July 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 11, 2025, 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 (Wild West Domains, LLC.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 15, 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 July 17, 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 July 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Azevedo as the sole panelist in this matter on August 15, 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 is one of the European leading domestic parcel delivery enterprises.

The Complainant operates internationally under the DPD brand and owns several trademarks, including the International trademark No. 761146, registered on May 26, 2001.

The Complainant also operates domain names incorporating its mark, including <dpd.com>, registered on March 20, 1991.

The disputed domain name <dpdexpresss.com> was registered on May 3, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website under the title “DPD Express”, in which alleged logistics and goods transport services are advertised. On the home page of this site, there is an image of a delivery truck with the same shade of red used in the Complainant brand and trucks.

#### **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:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name reproduces the DPD trademark in its entirety and merely adds the descriptive term “express” and a misspelling with an additional “s,” which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant submits that the dominant and distinctive element “dpd” is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant affirms that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant nor authorized to use its trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. The Complainant emphasizes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name using a privacy service and later updated the registration with incomplete contact information.
- (iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant’s rights and well-known trademark. It asserts that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a fraudulent website that copies the Complainant’s branding, including logos, color scheme, and textual references to the Complainant, with the apparent aim of deceiving users and collecting personal information or payments fraudulently. This conduct, according to the Complainant, constitutes bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to be entitled to a transfer of the disputed domain name, a complainant shall prove the following three elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The trademark DPD is wholly encompassed within the disputed domain name, together with the suffix "expresss", as well as with the generic Top Level-Domain ("gTLD") extension ".com".

Although the addition of other terms, incorrect wording or spelling errors (here, "expresss"), 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 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well established that the addition of a gTLD, such as ".com", is typically disregarded when determining whether a domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark as such is viewed as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 3.0](#), 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.

The Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the use of its well-known trademark to the Respondent, and the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is linked to a website offering transportation services under a "DPD Express" logo. However, according to the Complainant, the Respondent is not an authorized service provider, nor has obtained any permission for such use of trademark.

Additionally, by encompassing the Complainant's trademark DPD in the disputed domain name and entitling the respective website "DPD Express", the Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website providing competing services which may cause Internet users' confusion. Such use cannot be considered as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3.

The Panel has no doubt that "dpd" is a term directly connected with the Complainant's services.

Based on the available 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may 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.

The Panel concludes that it is not feasible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and that the registration of the disputed domain name was a mere coincidence.

Annex 4 to the Complaint shows registrations for the DPD trademark obtained by the Complainant as early as in 2001. When the disputed domain name was registered (in 2025), the DPD trademark was already connected with the Complainant's parcel delivery services.

The disputed domain name includes the distinctive trademark DPD in its entirety, just adding the suffix "express". In fact, the adoption of a typo of the term "express" amplifies the potential for confusion in the present case, in which the Complainant trademark is used for transportation and logistics services.

Furthermore, according to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

Actually, the content at the website linked to the disputed domain name - including reproductions of the Complainant's trademark, under similar colors, to offer competing transportation services -, make it clear that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract the Complainant's customers, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Finally, the absence of a formal reply from the Respondent to the Complainant's contentions and of any justification of the use of the trademark further support a finding of bad faith in the present case. 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 <dpdexpresss.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Rodrigo Azevedo/*

**Rodrigo Azevedo**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 2, 2025