

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co v. stoner bir
Case No. D2025-3704

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is stoner bir, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dpdexpressshipping.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 September 12, 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 15, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)/HOSTINGER operations, UAB) 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 the amended Complaint and amendment to the Complaint on September 16, 2025, and September 19, 2025, respectively.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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. However, the Respondent sent the email communications to the Center on September 25, 2025, proposing a settlement. On September 26, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that if they would like to explore settlement options, the Complainant should submit a request for suspension. No suspension

request was received from the Complainant. On October 28, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment.

The Center appointed Andrew Brown K.C. 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 is one of Europe's leading domestic parcel networks. It is headquartered in Germany and commenced operations in 1977. It has 57,000 delivery personnel and a network of more than 108,000 pickup points.

The Complainant owns registrations for the trademark DPD in many countries around the world in relation to goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 39, and 42.

In particular, the Complainant holds the following trademark registrations ("the DPD Trademark").

Mark Classes	No.	Jurisdiction	Date of Registration
DPD 9, 16, 35, 39, and 42	1217471	International registration	March 28, 2014
DPD and box logo 36 and 39	761146	International registration	May 26, 2001
Box logo and DPD 9, 16, 35, 39, and 42	019066263	European Union	July 5, 2025
Box logo and DPD 9, 16, 35, 39, and 42	1839770	International registration	September 20, 2024

The Complainant owns numerous domain names prominently featuring "dpd". These include <dpd.com> reserved on March 20, 1991. It also owns <dpdexpress.com>, <dpd-shipping.com>, <dpdgroupeexpress.com>, and <dpd-spedition.com>. The Complainant actively uses <dpd.com>.

The disputed domain name, registered on July 1, 2025, resolves to a website that reproduces the Complainant's trademark and logo, and purports to provide shipping solutions.

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 has trademark rights to the DPD Trademark in respect of its parcel delivery network and services. It claims that it uses its trademark to deliver 5.3 million parcels each day or 2.1 billion parcels annually. In 2023, its turnover under this trademark was EUR 15.7 billion.

The Complainant contends that the dominant and distinctive element of its DPD Trademark is reproduced in its entirety and identically in the disputed domain name. Further, it asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's DPD Trademark. In addition, the Complainant claims that the addition of the words "express" and "shipping" in the disputed domain name are descriptive and directly related to the Complainant's activities of fast and rapid sending of parcels as well as being highly confusing.

The Complainant relies on a number of previous panel decisions where findings of confusing similarity have been found where the disputed domain name comprised “dpd” and another descriptive term.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard the Complainant states:

- (a) that there is no business or legal relationship between it and the Respondent.
- (b) that the Respondent has not been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the name “dpd” or the DPD Trademark.
- (c) that to its knowledge, the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name, nor is he offering a bona fide product or services.

Accordingly, the Complainant states that there is no legitimate interests why the Respondent would register or use the DPD Trademark in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name has been registered with the aim of taking advantage of the reputation in the Complainant’s DPD Trademark. It states that the Respondent’s association of “dpd” with the terms “express” and “shipping” was not made by chance but deliberately to cause confusion with the Complainant and to give credibility to his request for personal information from Internet users visiting the site. The Complainant further states that this was to give credibility to the Respondent’s scams and phishing operations. The Complainant says the Respondent plainly had knowledge of both it and its DPD Trademark at the time the disputed domain name was registered.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name involves opportunistic 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 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.

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

The Panel further finds that the DPD Trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Previous panels have held that the inclusion of the DPD Trademark in a disputed domain name with additional terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the DPD Trademark for the purpose of the first element in the following cases (see also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8): <dpd-shipping.com>: *DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co v. Andy Mani, Dynamic Parcel Distribution*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2379](#) and <dpdexpresss.com>: *DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co v. Suhel Ahmed*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2751](#).

The Panel finds that 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 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 finds the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith for the following reasons:

- (a) the Complainant has clearly demonstrated its rights to the DPD Trademark and that its trademark was well known prior to registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant’s first use commenced in 1977.
- (b) the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant’s DPD Trademark. A trademark search of this mark or even an Internet search by the Respondent for that trademark would have revealed the Complainant and its longstanding use of its DPD Trademark. Even more to the point, the Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant and its reputation of its DPD Trademark because he chose to add the descriptive words “express” and “shipping” to “dpd” in the disputed domain name. These added terms reflect many of the Complainant’s activities.

The Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons:

- (a) The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent is seeking to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s well-known DPD Trademark by using it to attract Internet users to the disputed domain name and the landing pages located there. Internet users encountering the disputed domain name will be misled or confused into believing that the services offered on the website at the disputed domain name are provided by the Complainant when that is not the case. In the landing pages the Respondent has used images and logos which copy and emulate the Complainant’s webpage.
- (b) The use appears likely to cause damage and loss to the Complainant because of the way it seeks to have Internet users provide their personal information. This is likely to lead to phishing or other scams which will adversely reflect on the Complainant’s reputation and DPD Trademark.

- (c) The Panel is entitled to draw and does draw any adverse inferences from the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complaint and to the factual allegations made by the Complainant.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds 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 <dpdexpressshipping.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew Brown K.C./

Andrew Brown K.C.

Sole Panelist

Date: November 14, 2025