

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Federal Express Corporation v. Name Redacted and Fedexfly Logistics International Packers & Movers (OPC) Pvt. Ltd.

Case No. D2025-4488

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Federal Express Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Rahul Chaudhry & Partners, India.

The Respondents are Name Redacted (“First Respondent”)¹, and Fedexfly Logistics International Packers & Movers (OPC) Pvt. Ltd., India (“Second Respondent”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fedexflylogisticsipm.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 30, 2025. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 31, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the First Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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”).

¹ The Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name that includes the names of both Respondents. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 1, 2025. The First Respondent sent email communications to the Center on November 11, November 16, November 18, November 28, and December 10, 2025. The Center also received an email communication sent from an email address using the disputed domain name on November 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on December 30, 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, founded in 1971, operates in the field of transportation and logistics, providing multinational courier delivery services, among other services. Its services network reaches more than 220 countries and territories, including India. The Complainant owns trademarks in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States trademark registration number 1311503 for FEDEX, registered on December 25, 1984, specifying services in class 39;
- Indian trademark registration number 458159 for FEDEX, registered on October 30, 1992, specifying goods in class 16; and
- International Trademark Registration number 1176410 for a semi-figurative FEDEX mark, registered on August 15, 2013, designating multiple jurisdictions, including India, specifying services in class 39.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant's FEDEX mark was officially recognized as a well-known mark by the Indian Trade Marks Registry on February 19, 2024. The Complainant has also registered multiple domain names, including fedex.com, created on February 26, 1991, that it uses in connection with its global website where it provides information about itself and its services, and fedex.in, created on February 11, 2005, that redirects to fedex.com.

The First Respondent is an individual based in India. He worked on the development of the website associated with the disputed domain name.

The Second Respondent is a relocation company offering moving and related services, incorporated on April 2, 2024. It filed Indian trademark application number 6659609 on October 8, 2024, for a semi-figurative FEDEXFLY LOGISTICS INTERNATIONAL PACKERS AND MOVERS (OPC) PVT LTD mark, specifying services in class 39. That trademark application is currently pending.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 23, 2024. It resolves to a website for the Second Respondent. The website prominently displays a "FedExFLY Logistics" logo.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Second Respondent on March 21, 2025.

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 its FEDEX mark.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondents bear no relationship to the business of the Complainant and are neither a licensee nor have obtained authorization of any kind whatsoever to use the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is deceptively similar to the Complainant's FEDEX mark and is used to offer identical services. The associated website uses a logo that attempts to mimic the Complainant's distinctive semi-figurative FEDEX mark.

B. Respondents

The First Respondent submits that he has no involvement or association with the disputed domain name and does not otherwise reply to the Complainant's contentions. On November 14, 2025, the Center received an email communication sent from an email address using the disputed domain name, which appears to be associated with the Second Respondent, the website operator. The email offered a transfer of the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issues

A. Identity of the Respondents

Paragraph 1 of the Rules defines the respondent as "the holder of a domain name registration against which a complaint is initiated".

The Registrar has verified that the First Respondent is listed in the Whois database as the holder of the disputed domain name registration. However, the First Respondent requests that the Panel disregard his name and contact information. He submits that he is not the owner, registrant, or administrator of the disputed domain name but was only the developer who worked on the associated website temporarily. He submits that the current holder of the disputed domain name is the Second Respondent and its contact person, referred to below as "VK". The Complaint was initiated against both the First Respondent and the Second Respondent.

The issue as to who should be named as the Respondent in cases involving a beneficial holder or identity questions in the context of the agent/beneficial holder relationship has been discussed by previous UDRP panels. The existence of a beneficial holder should not serve generally to renege on the obligations and responsibilities that a registrant of a domain name has by virtue of its registration. See *Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP v. Job*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0592](#).

In the present case, correspondence on record shows that a web hosting service moved the disputed domain name under an account associated with VK's email address in January 2025 and that the First Respondent attempted to update the Whois record prior to this dispute. Pursuant to a request to list VK as the registrant of the disputed domain name received on June 7, 2025, the web hosting service requested the First Respondent and VK to approve or decline updated Whois details but no response to this request is on

file. In the circumstances, it seems reasonable to infer that the First Respondent was a contractor to the Second Respondent.

An email communication was received by the Center during this proceeding that appears to be associated with the Second Respondent, offering a transfer of the disputed domain name, which suggests that the Second Respondent exercises control over the disputed domain name.

In light of the above, the Panel determines that the First Respondent and the Second Respondent are both Respondents in this dispute (referred to below separately and collectively as “the Respondent”, except as otherwise indicated).

B. Redaction of the First Respondent’s Name

Paragraph 4(j) of the Policy provides that all decisions under the Policy will be published in full over the Internet, except when a panel determines in an exceptional case to redact portions of its decision. See also paragraph 16(b) of the Rules.

In the present case, the First Respondent requested an update of the Whois record for the disputed domain name prior to this dispute. The Panel has found it reasonable to infer that the First Respondent was a contractor to the Second Respondent. The Panel finds it likely the First Respondent did not intend that his personal details be made public. Therefore, the Panel has redacted the name of the First Respondent from this Decision.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate each of the following elements:

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

The burden of proof of each element is borne by 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 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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the FEDEX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the FEDEX mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name as its initial element. Despite the addition of the terms “fly logistics”, and the letters “ipm” (which could be short for “international packers & movers”), the mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only additional element in the disputed domain name is the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) extension (“.com”) which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website developed by the First Respondent for the Second Respondent, a relocation company offering moving and related services. Nothing indicates that the First Respondent, as the website’s developer, makes any ongoing use of the disputed domain name. Nor is he making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Further, the Registrar has verified the First Respondent’s name as an individual and as a business, neither of which resembles the disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the First Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

As regards the Second Respondent, the website operator, the Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, which combines the well-known FEDEX mark with descriptive words and an abbreviation, and the presentation of the associated website, which prominently displays a logo incorporating “FEDEX” with a capitalized second “e” in the same way as the Complainant’s semi-figurative mark and offers services in the same sector as the Complainant, give the impression that the Second Respondent or its services are affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. However, it is clear from the record that the Second Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant. The Panel takes note that the Second Respondent’s company name corresponds to the disputed domain name. However, on balance, that name appears to have been chosen to create a false impression of affiliation with, or endorsement by, the Complainant. Further, while the Second Respondent has filed an Indian trademark application, that application is still pending.

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.

Based on the record, 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2024, years after the registration of the Complainant's FEDEX mark in India, and after the recognition of FEDEX as a well-known mark by the Indian Trade Marks Registry. "Fedex" is not a dictionary word but a portmanteau term, formed from the initial syllables of the first two words in the Complainant's company name (i.e., "Federal Express"). The disputed domain name wholly incorporates that mark as its initial element and combines it with, among other things, the term "logistics", which describes the nature of the Complainant's services. The associated website offers services in the same sector as the Complainant. The website logo represents "FedEx" with a capitalized second "e" in the same way as the Complainant's semi-figurative mark. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's FEDEX mark when he registered the disputed domain name.

As regards use, the disputed domain name resolves to a website for a relocation company offering moving and related services. The composition of the disputed domain name and the presentation of the associated website give the false impression that the website operator or its services are affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. Given the findings in section 6.2B above, the Panel finds that these circumstances fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <fedexflylogisticsipm.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: January 13, 2026