ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Estafeta Mexicana, S.A. de C.V. v. zha wang
Case No. D2025-4175

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Estafeta Mexicana, S.A. de C.V., Mexico, represented by Calderon & De La Sierra, Mexico.

The Respondent is zha wang, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <estasfeta.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 11, 2025. On October 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On October 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 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 October 16, 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 October 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 13, 2025

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on November 20, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant was founded in 1979 in Mexico City offering door-to-door service instead of relying on public transportation or intercity buses. It is currently employing more than 12,400 people, with a fleet of approximately 5,000 vehicles, 129 distribution centers, three logistics hubs, and its own cargo airline which operates in both Mexico and the United States of America.

The Complainant has registered the trademark ESTAFETA in multiple jurisdictions, such as Mexican trademark registrations nos. 546615, registered on April 24, 1997; 548675, registered on May 23, 1997; 2042803, registered on September 26, 2019; and 2042804, registered on September 26, 2019.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <estafeta.com> and uses it to promote the Complainant's businesses.

The Domain Name was registered on December 3, 2024. According to the Complaint, the Domain Name "is not used to offer any product or service" and appears as "a page not available". The Domain Name currently also resolves to an error page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations. The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar and even practically identical to the Complainant's trademark. The Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the letter "s". The Complainant believes this minimal difference does not prevent the consumer from associating the Domain Name with the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent knew of the international prestige of the Complainant's trademark and used it without authorization with the sole purpose of preventing the Complainant from using the Domain Name and potential customers from accessing the products and services offered by the Complainant.

The Complainant believes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Domian Name phonetically reproduces in an almost identical manner the Complainant's trademark to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users. Although the Domain Name is not currently listed for sale, the Registrar's search platform offers an option to acquire it, which shows that the owner is open to financial gain. This conduct constitutes bad faith, and it hinders the commercial activity of the Complainant and diverts legitimate consumer traffic to an unauthorized site.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark ESTAFETA. In this case, the Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the letter "s" in the middle. The addition does not prevent confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain, see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a corresponding name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, to which the Respondent has not rebutted. Therefore, 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.

The Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Name. It follows from the composition of the Domain Name and prior registration of the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent has not offered any explanation as to why it registered a domain name almost identical to the Complainant's trademark, nor provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. On the balance of probabilities, the Respondent has attempted to target the Complainant's trademark when registering the Domain Name. The current non-use of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding considering the reputation of the Complainant and

its trademark in its industry, the composition of the Domain Name and the lack of a response from the Respondent. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3.

Based on the record, 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 the Domain Name <estasfeta.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Sole Panelist
Date: November 27, 2025