

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. v. Ugo Blade Case No. D2025-3700

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ugo Blade, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dpdexpressgo.com> is registered with DreamHost, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 11, 2025. On September 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 12, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 16, 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 September 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 September 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on September 30, 2025, October 3, 2025, and October 28, 2025. The Supplemental Filing was received from the Complainant on October 6, 2025. On October 28, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Rebecca Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on October 31, 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 runs Europe's leading domestic parcel delivery network. The Complainant delivers 5.3 million parcels daily and 2.1 billion parcels annually via its 57,000 delivery experts and over 108,000 pick-up points.

The Complainant holds registrations for the DPD trade mark in numerous jurisdictions, including International Trade Mark Registration No. 1839770 for DPD composite mark (registered September, 20, 2024) and International Trade Mark Registration No. 761146 for DPD composite mark (registered May 26, 2001) (the "Trade Mark"). The Complainant further claims that it holds Nigerian Registration Nos. 19254, 19255, 19257 and 19258 for DPD composite mark in different classes (registered August 19, 2025). The Complainant also holds numerous trade mark registrations for DPD GROUP as a composite mark.

The Complainant is also the registrant of numerous domain names incorporating the Trade Mark, including <dpd.com> (registered March 20, 1991).

The Respondent is an individual. The Respondent did not submit a formal response but sent several emails to the Center. He initially advised that he is the web developer for the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name supports a legally registered and active logistics and shipping business established in Nigeria.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 26, 2025.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering logistics services and displaying "DPD EXPRESS GO", with some sections being apparently incomplete. The disputed domain name does not currently direct to an active website.

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 Trade Mark is reproduced in its entirety and identically in the disputed domain name. The association with the words "express" and "go", which are descriptive and directly related to the Complainant's activities of sending parcels and letters, are highly confusing.
- There is no legal or business relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the Trade Mark. To the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name leads to a fraudulent website.
- The disputed domain name has been registered with the aim of taking advantage of the reputation of the Trade Mark. The Respondent is deliberately using the Trade Mark to create confusion with the Complainant in order to give credibility to the Respondent's requests for personal information from users and to carry out scams and phishing operations. The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant registered its portfolio of DPD trade marks. Considering the reputation of the Complainant and

the scope of its operations, it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. This suggests opportunistic bad faith.

- In its Supplemental Filing, the Complainant contends that the Respondent misrepresents that the Complainant does not operate in Nigeria and refers to its Nigerian registrations for the Trade Mark. It further asserts that the Respondent's statement that its business is targeted exclusively at Nigeria is contrary to the fact and points to the website elements supporting its claim that the website has an international reach.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not provide a formal response. The Respondent advises in his email communications to the Center that:

- The owner of the disputed domain name has invested substantial resources into building their shipping business in Nigeria.
- The owner was willing to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant for USD 5,000 (to cover its transition costs).
- The business name "DPD" was chosen in good faith and stands for Dongo (a town in Borno State, Nigeria, where the business began), Parcel and Delivery. To the best of the Respondent's knowledge, no other business within Nigeria has used or registered the name "DPD" in relation to logistics or shipping services. The business and brand have been developed exclusively within Nigeria, with no intention to mislead or to take advantage of the Complainant's international reputation.
- The Nigerian business predates the disputed domain name. The business was conducted through calls and direct client interactions before registering the disputed domain name. The website at the disputed domain name is still under construction. Any incomplete sections are not evidence of fraudulent activity, but of the current stage of development.
- The website at the disputed domain name was not created for fraudulent purposes. Any resemblance to the Complainant's services is coincidental, as terms like "express" and "go" are common in the logistics and delivery sector.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel notes at the outset that on October 6, 2025, the Complainant filed an unsolicited Supplemental Filing. The Panel in its discretion decides that it is appropriate to admit and consider the Complainant's Supplemental Filing insofar as it provides arguments relevant for the merits of the case and addressing the statements made in the Response. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.6.

Further, the Panel notes that the Respondent initially claimed that he is a web developer and an official contact point for the disputed domain name, but later sent email communications with substantive arguments asserting to be "writing as the Respondent". Insofar as the Respondent's statements can be perceived as an assertion that he does not own the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Registrar-disclosed Respondent has not provided any details disclosing the identity and contact information of the alleged beneficial holder. The Panel will therefore consider the Registrar-disclosed registrant, Ugo Blade, as the Respondent in the present proceedings.

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on 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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "express" and "go") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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. Specifically:

- The Respondent makes broad statements in relation to the history of the business conducted through the website at the disputed domain name, however, does not provide any evidence of its existence and/or the bona fide of its service offering (for example, company formation documents, relevant authorizations or permits, service documentation, customer agreements, invoices and receipts, shipping and delivery records, advertising campaigns, customer communications).
- The Respondent makes statements about the origin of the business name "DPD" but does not provide any evidence that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.
- The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Trade Mark.

The evidence provided by the Complainant (i.e., screenshots of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves) indicates that the disputed domain name has rather been used to either: (a) impersonate the Complainant and its business; or (b) to create the incorrect impression that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant. Previous panels have consistently held that such use of a domain name does not

represent a bona fide offering because it capitalizes on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's trade mark.

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.

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

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

The Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark, given: (a) the worldwide reputation of the Complainant and the Trade Mark; and (b) the composition of the disputed domain name. While the terms "express" and "go" are descriptive of the parcel delivery services which both Parties seem to be offering, the Respondent's explanation for its choice to include "DPD" in the disputed domain which is the Complainant's well known Trade Mark, including the fact that it started to provide its services in Dongo, Nigeria, is not supported by any evidence. Moreover, the Panel notes in this regard that the website at the disputed domain name displayed a contact address of its "headquarters" in the United States. The Panel therefore finds, on balance, that the Respondent's goal in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users for potential gain, taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's Trade Mark.

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 <dpdexpressgo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rebecca Slater/

Rebecca Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025