

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc. v. Ashhad Ur Rehman, Valhalla Logistic LLC
Case No. D2025-3895

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Ashhad Ur Rehman, Valhalla Logistic LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <olddominionfreightline.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) 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 24, 2025. On September 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 29, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 7, 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 amended Complaint on October 9, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 October 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Lynda M. Braun as the sole panelist in this matter on November 21, 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

Founded in 1934, the Complainant is a Virginia corporation with its principal place of business in North Carolina, United States. The Complainant is a large North American less-than truckload (“LTL”) motor carrier providing regional, inter-regional and national LTL services through a single integrated organization. The Complainant’s service offerings, which include expedited transportation, are provided through an expansive network of service centers located throughout the continental United States.

The Complainant owns several registered trademarks through the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), including, but not limited to: OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE, United States Registration No.4,316,040, registered on April 9, 2013, with a date of first use and a date of first use in commerce of December 31, 1954, in International Class 39; and ODFL, United States Registration No. 4,268,384, registered on January 1, 2013, in International Class 39 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark”).

The Complainant owns the domain name <odfl.com>, which resolves to its official website at “www.odfl.com”, and through which the Complainant markets and renders its services.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 19, 2025, and initially resolved to an active website that mimicked and impersonated the Complainant’s own website, and which prominently displayed the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark, as well as other marks owned by the Complainant¹. The Respondent also configured the Disputed Domain Name for email functions through mail exchange (“MX”) servers. The Disputed Domain Name was also used to send fraudulent text messages to the Complainant’s customers. The Complainant’s customers were thus led to believe that they were interacting with the Complainant.

In one such transaction, the Complainant learned of the Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a scam wherein the Respondent contacted an independent truck driver via a text message in an attempt to pass off as the Complainant. This fraudulent scheme permitted the Respondent to contract with the independent truck driver to move freight for the Respondent (acting as the Complainant) and required the truck driver to pay a fee to a broker, whereby after being provided with the Disputed Domain Name, the truck driver was able to track the bill of lading through the Disputed Domain Name. Screenshots of the exchange of text messages were submitted by the Complainant as an annex to the Complaint.

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 is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark because the Disputed Domain Name contains the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark in its entirety, albeit misspelled with an additional letter “n” in the term “dominion”, followed by the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, and thus does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity;

¹As of the date of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an error landing page that states: “This page isn’t working. **olddominionfreightline.com** didn’t send any data.”

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, among other things, the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register a domain name containing the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark, and the Respondent was not making a bona fide offering of goods or services through the Disputed Domain Name; and

- the Disputed Domain Name was registered and was used in bad faith because, among other things, the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant and copy its website and send fraudulent messages to the Complainant's customers.

The Complainant seeks the transfer of the Disputed Domain Name from the Respondent to the Complainant in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant prove the following three elements in order to prevail in this proceeding:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a two-fold inquiry: a threshold investigation into whether a complainant has rights in a trademark, followed by an assessment of whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark. The Panel concludes that in the present case, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark, differing only by the misspelling of the mark by adding an extra letter "n" to the medial position of the term "dominion".

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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

It is uncontroverted that the Complainant has established rights in the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark based on its registered trademarks for the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark in the United States. The registration of a mark satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case. As stated in section 1.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), "[w]here the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case". The Panel finds that the Complainant satisfied the threshold requirement of having trademark rights in the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark.

The OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name as it is nearly identical to the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark, albeit misspelled by adding an extra letter "n" to the term "dominion" in the trademark. Such a minor modification to a disputed domain name is commonly referred to as "typosquatting" and seeks to wrongfully take advantage of errors by a user in typing a domain

name into a web browser. The misspelling of the term “dominion” to “dominnion” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity to the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9: “A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element”; see also *Express Scripts, Inc. v. Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc. / Domaindeals, Domain Administrator*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1302](#); *Singapore Press Holdings Limited v. Leong Meng Yew*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1080](#).

Finally, the addition of a gTLD such as “.com” in a domain name is a technical requirement. Thus, it is well established that, as here, such element may typically be disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. Thus, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark.

Based on the available record, 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 that 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, given the facts as set out above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case. The Respondent has not submitted any arguments or evidence to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case. Furthermore, the Complainant has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark. Nor does the Complainant have any type of business relationship with the Respondent. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or by any similar name, nor any evidence that the Respondent was using or making demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. See Policy, paragraph 4(c).

Further, based on the use made by the Respondent of the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant, copy its website, and to perpetuate a fraudulent scheme to deceive the Complainant’s customers does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1 (“Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.”). See also *CMA CGM v. Diana Smith*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1774](#) (finding that the respondent had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, holding that a “scam cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name”). This is precisely what occurred here, where the Respondent sent fraudulent text messages incorporating the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant and deceive the Complainant’s customers.

In sum, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established an un rebutted prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel finds that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name for commercial gain with the intent to mislead and defraud

third parties associated with the Complainant by incorporating the Disputed Domain Name into fraudulent text messages sent by the Respondent in the name of the Complainant. Such use cannot conceivably constitute a bona fide offering of a product or service within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The Panel further concludes that nothing on the record before it would support a finding that the Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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. The Panel finds that based on the record, the Complainant has demonstrated the existence of the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name, 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.

First, based on the circumstances here, the Panel concludes that the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name had been done for the specific purpose of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent and/or trading on the name and reputation of the Complainant and its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark. See *Madonna Ciccone, p/k/a Madonna v. Dan Parisi and "Madonna.com"*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0847](#) ("[t]he only plausible explanation for Respondent's actions appears to be an intentional effort to trade upon the fame of Complainant's name and mark for commercial gain").

Second, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy due to the Respondent's reported use of a fraudulent scheme in which the Respondent impersonated the Complainant and sent text messages to the Complainant's customers, presumably for the Respondent to deceive the Complainant's customers and have them make payments to the Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4 (use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as impersonation/passing off is considered evidence of bad faith). See also *Stichting BDO v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 7151571251/ gregory Motto*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2023](#) (finding use of an email address incorporating the disputed domain name to fraudulently obtain payment of invoices to be evidence of bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy for intentionally misleading and confusing third parties into believing that the Respondent was the Complainant). Thus, use of a disputed domain name for illegal activity demonstrated the Respondent's bad faith and is precisely the type of conduct that the Policy aims to proscribe.

Third, the Panel finds that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark when registering the Disputed Domain Name, emblematic of bad faith registration and use. It strains credulity to believe that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant or its well-known OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark, as evidenced by the Respondent's use of the Mark in the Disputed Domain Name, albeit with a minor misspelling. Thus, the Panel finds that in the present case, the Respondent had the Complainant's OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark in mind when registering and using the Disputed Domain Name, demonstrating bad faith.

Finally, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name contains an intentional misspelling of the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE Mark, which further supports a finding of bad faith registration and use. See *Nutricia International BV v. Eric Starling*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0773](#).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <olddominnionfreightline.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lynda M. Braun/

Lynda M. Braun

Sole Panelist

Date: December 5, 2025