

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc. v. Abdul Rehman and Ashhad Ur Rehman  
Case No. D2025-4500

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondents are Abdul Rehman, Pakistan, and Ashhad Ur Rehman, Pakistan.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain names <olddominionfreightlane.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. The disputed domain name <olddominionnfreightline.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (collectively the “Registrars”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 30, 2025. On October 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 31 and November 3, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 3, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain name associated with a different underlying registrant or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 3, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 30, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on December 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Stefan Bojovic as the sole panelist in this matter on December 4, 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 the US company founded in 1934 and 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 also offers a range of value-added services including container drayage, truckload brokerage, and supply chain consulting.

The Complainant is the owner of several registered trademarks for its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark, including the US trademark registration No. 4316040 for OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE (word mark) registered on April 9, 2013.

In addition, the Complainant operates its website at the domain name <odfl.com>, where the Complainant markets and renders its services.

The disputed domain name <olddominionfreightlane.com> was registered on October 26, 2025 and it used to resolve to a website imitating the Complainant's official website and using its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE word mark and logo. At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website.

The disputed domain name <olddominionnfreightline.com> was registered on October 28, 2025 and it used to resolve to a website using the Complainant's logo and offering freight shipping tools. At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website.

#### **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark, as they both consist of an intentional misspelling of the trademark. In case of the disputed domain name <olddominionfreightlane.com>, the disputed domain name wholly incorporates OLD DOMINION FREIGHT portion of the trademark, but intentionally misspells word "line" as "lane", while in case of the disputed domain name <olddominionnfreightline.com> an extra letter "n" is added to "dominion" portion of the Complainant's trademark.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, the Complainant contends that the Respondents have no prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not commonly known by the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark or any reasonable variation thereof that would confer rights or a legitimate interest. Moreover, the Complainant has

not authorized the Respondents to use the Complainant's trademark, nor are the Respondents licensees of the Complainant's trademark. As the disputed domain names are nearly identical with the Complainant's trademark, they carry a high risk of implied affiliation. The Respondents cannot assert that they have been using the disputed domain names, prior to any notice of the present dispute, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or that they have made demonstrable preparation to do so, in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy nor would the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names ever qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Specifically, the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names is in furtherance of illegal activity, namely, impersonation/passing off and possibly also harvesting of personal information under false pretenses and actively scamming independent drivers into believing that they are contracting with the Complainant.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant states that its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE is highly distinctive and well-known mark and has been used in commerce by the Complainant for at least the past 71 years which stretches credibility that the Respondents would have a legitimate speculative reason for registering the disputed domain names other than specifically targeting the Complainant, which amounts to registration of the disputed domain names in bad faith. Regarding the use of the disputed domain names in bad faith, the Complainant asserts that prior panel decisions have consistently and unequivocally recognized that registration of domain name which used in furtherance of fraudulent/illegal activities, such as impersonation/passing off, for example, are evidence of bad faith registration and use of the domain name. Lastly, the Complainant believes that the Respondents are the same as the respondent that is the subject of the UDRP proceedings related to the domain name <olddominionfreightline.com> (*Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc. v. Ashhad Ur Rehman, Valhalla Logistic LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3895](#)), because the identical scam was perpetrated using the domain name <olddominionfreightline.com> that is occurring with the disputed domain names and the Complainant submits that this demonstrates that the Respondents are serial cybersquatters/abusive domain registrants and this fact negates any inferences that could possibly be made in the Respondents' favor on the issue of bad faith.

## **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that although the disputed domain names are registered by the nominally different domain name registrants, using different Registrars, they share a number of commonalities that include the following:

- Both disputed domain names used to resolve to websites using the Complainant's logo and offering freight shipping services;
- Both disputed domain names share a very similar composition, consist of typographical variations of the Complainant's OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark and are registered under the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD");
- Both disputed domain names share the same name servers;
- The disputed domain names were registered in close temporal proximity, on October 26, 2025 and October 28, 2025; and
- Both disputed domain names are registered in the name of individuals with the same surname, allegedly residing in the Punjab province of Pakistan.

Having in mind the above, the Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that both disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

## **6.2. Substantive Issues**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy stipulates that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

### **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 second-level portion of the first disputed domain name, "olddominionfreightlane," is highly similar to the Complainant's OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark, the sole difference being the replacement of the letter "i" with the letter "a" in the term "line." The second-level portion of the second disputed domain name, "olddominionnfreightline," differs from the Complainant's trademark only by the addition of the letter "n" in the term "dominion." Such minor letter substitutions and additions are insufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity. 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

Therefore, the Panel finds the Complainant's OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

In addition, it is well established that “.com”, as a gTLD, can be disregarded in the assessment of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel, therefore, 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that there seems to be no relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant and that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark. There appears to be no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain names.

On the contrary, the Respondent appears to be a party to at least one prior UDRP proceeding involving the same Complainant and with very similar factual background (see *Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc. v. Ashhad Ur Rehman, Valhalla Logistic LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3895](#)). Under such circumstances, it is difficult to imagine any legitimate interest on the Respondent’s side that would justify its actions.

The disputed domain name <olddominionfreightlane.com> used to resolve to a website which was a copycat version of the Complainant’s official website, and the disputed domain name <olddominionnfreightline.com> used to resolve to a website using the Complainant’s logo and offering freight shipping tools. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation and passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel also finds that the composition of the disputed domain names coupled with their prior impersonating use, reflect the Respondent’s ultimate intent to confuse unsuspecting Internet users into believing that the disputed domain names are operated by the Complainant.

Having in mind the above, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant and its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names. Namely, the registration and use of OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark predate the registration of the disputed domain names by decades, making it unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. The fact that the Respondent has chosen the domain names that differ from the Complainant's trademark only in replacement of a single letter or addition of a single letter further indicates that the Respondent intentionally selected the disputed domain names as they are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and intending to target the latter. The Panel is also mindful of the fact that there seems to be a pattern of such conduct on the Respondent's side, since there is at least one prior UDRP case involving one of the registrants confirmed by the Registrars and relating to the registration of a typo version of the Complainant's OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark (see *Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc. v. Ashhad Ur Rehman, Valhalla Logistic LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3895](#)). Finally, the prior use of the disputed domain names for impersonation of the Complainant leaves no room for doubt on the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE trademark and evidences that the Respondent actually had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain names.

Due to the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered in bad faith.

As previously indicated, the disputed domain names used to resolve to websites imitating the Complainant's official website or using its logo and offering the same services as the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation and passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

While the disputed domain names no longer resolve to active websites, such inactivity does not prevent a finding of bad faith given the totality of the circumstances of the case at hand. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been both registered and are being used in bad faith, and consequently 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 names <olddominionfreightlane.com> and <olddominionnfreightline.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Stefan Bojovic/*

**Stefan Bojovic**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 21, 2025