

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Estafeta Mexicana, S.A. de C.V. v. he yunfei
Case No. D2025-4176

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is he yunfei, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <estazfeta.com> 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 disputed domain name. On October 13, 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 (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 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 7, 2025.

The Center appointed María Alejandra López García as the sole panelist in this matter on November 12, 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 a Mexican company founded in 1979, dedicated to express courier and parcel services. The Complainant has developed and incorporated technology into its services, innovating in the market. The Complainant employs more than 12,400 staff members, operates a fleet of approximately 5,000 vehicles, has 129 distribution centers, three logistics hubs, and its own cargo airline, Estafeta Carga Aérea, which offers services in Mexico and the United States of America.

The Complainant owns, among many others, the following trademark registrations:

- Mexican trademark for ESTAFETA (word mark), Registration No. 2042803, registered on September 26, 2019, in force until May 30, 2029, in International Class ("IC") 35;
- Mexican trademark for ESTAFETA (word mark), Registration No. 2042805, registered on September 26, 2019, in force until May 30, 2029, in IC 42; and
- Costa Rican trademark for ESTAFETA (word mark), Registration No. 105660, registered on February 3, 1998, in force until February 3, 2028, in IC 38.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <estafeta.com>, which was created on March 27, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 6, 2025. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name "is not used to offer any product or service" and when entering the disputed domain name, the website appeared as "a page not available". The Panel also searched the disputed domain name at the website of Internet Archive and found that the captured screenshots of the disputed domain name dated January 8, March 6, and March 7, 2025 showed either "Not Found" or "error code: 522"¹.

By the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a "deceptive website" warning page provided, stating "Attackers on the site you tried visiting might trick you into installing software or revealing things like your passwords, phone, or credit card numbers".

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 its ESTAFETA trademark has achieved consumer recognition not only through its website and advertising, but also through its registered trademarks in multiple countries (including Mexico) and its reputation as a solid company and leader in express courier services.

¹Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.8.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ESTAFETA trademark, which is substantially reproduced, and that the minimal addition of the letter “z” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy.

As regards the lack of rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant contends that the Respondent does not hold any trademark registration in the term “estafeta”; that it has never authorized or granted any license to the Respondent to register and/or use its distinctive ESTAFETA trademark in any manner, including as a domain name.

Lastly, concerning the bad faith, the Complainant contends that the Respondent clearly targeted the Complainant, by registering a domain name that phonetically reproduces almost identically the Complainant’s widely known trademark ESTAFETA. The disputed domain name is offered for sale at the Registrar’s platform. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark and/or in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users, by creating confusion among the public as to the origin, sponsorship, affiliation, or connection with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy each of the three following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

To prevail, the Complainant must prove each of those requirements. No Response has been submitted by the Respondent, despite the opportunity to present its case. Therefore, this Panel shall analyze the evidence submitted by the Complainant and decide this dispute on that basis.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, the letter “z” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letter 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.

In relation to the generic Top-Level Domain “.com”, it is well established that such element may typically be disregarded when it is used as a technical requirement of a domain name registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

In this case, the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant’s ESTAFETA trademark and domain name <estafeta.com> by adding the letter “z” in the middle of the disputed domain name. Such composition potentially creates a risk of user confusion regarding the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the disputed domain name and its associated website as Internet users may not notice the subtle difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark and domain name.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to a “deceptive website” warning page provided by the browser, due to suspected phishing activity and was previously inactive. Nothing in the record suggests that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, as set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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.

According to the Complaint, the Complainant holds a widely known trademark in its industry with worldwide presence, and its trademarks were registered years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Therefore, by the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent most likely knew or should have known about the Complainant and its trademark, which constitutes bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Regarding its bad faith use, the disputed domain name did not previously resolve to an active page. Considering the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name being almost identical to the Complainant's trademark and domain name, and the lack of a response from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the passive holding doctrine. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to a "deceptive website" warning page provided by the browser, due to potentially harmful materials, i.e., malware, and suspected phishing activity, which does not change the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <estazfeta.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/María Alejandra López García/

María Alejandra López García

Sole Panelist

Date: November 26, 2025