

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

UZH Freight, Inc. v. Nick Springer and Name Redacted Case No. D2025-4555

1. The Parties

The Complainant is UZH Freight, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Scopelitis, Garvin, Light, Hanson & Feary, PC, United States.

The Respondents are Nick Springer, Armenia, and Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <uzbfreight.com> (<xn--uzbfreight-l5a.com>) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC. The disputed domain name <uzbfrieght.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (collectively, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 4, 2025. On November 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 6, 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 Respondent (John Doe / Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 7, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint 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 disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 12, 2025.

¹ The underlying registrant of the disputed domain name <uzbfrieght.com> appears to have used the name and contact details of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the name of this registrant from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the concerned Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name <uzbfrieght.com>, which includes the name provided as the registrant of the disputed domain name <uzbfrieght.com>. The Panel has authorised the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the concerned Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, 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](#).

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 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 4, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on December 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on December 9, 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 large motor carrier that trades under the mark UZB FREIGHT.

The Complainant owns United States registered trade mark No. 7,918 629 for UZB FREIGHT INC, filed on December 12, 2024, registered on August 26, 2025, in classes 35 and 39, with claimed first use in 2016.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.uzbfreight.com”.

The disputed domain name <uzbfrieght.com> was registered on March 19, 2025, and the disputed domain name <uzbfreight.com> (<xn--uzbfreght-l5a.com>) was registered on July 23, 2025.

There is no evidence or indication that the Respondents have used the disputed domain names for active websites. However, both disputed domain names have been used in fraudulent emails that impersonate the Complainant and attempt to steal cargo being shipped with the Complainant.

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.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain names are subject to common control, this not having been denied by the Respondents, and that, in the circumstances, consolidation is fair and equitable to all Parties, and also procedurally efficient. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.

In particular, the Panel notes that a number of fraudulent emails use/refer to both disputed domain names as email addresses within the same email.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding. The Respondents are collectively referred to below as “the Respondent”, unless it is necessary to refer to them separately.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the dominant element of the mark 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 particular, the disputed domain names consist of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of the term “UZB FREIGHT” of the Complainant’s trade mark, in that <uzbfrieght.com> reverses the “e” and “i” and <uzbfreight.com> adds an accent over the “i”. Such misspellings are considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the disputed domain names contain sufficiently recognisable aspects of the relevant mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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 recognised 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off and other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used 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.

While the disputed domain names were registered prior to the registration of the Complainant's trade mark, the Complainant had filed its trade mark application before the registration dates of the disputed domain names and the Panel is satisfied that, in any case, the Complainant has used its mark on its website "www.uzbfreight.com" since at least 2023, i.e., predating the registration of the disputed domain names². Considering the use of the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant in furtherance of a fraudulent email scheme, the Panel infers that, when registering the disputed domain names, the Respondent knew of, and intended to target, the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off and other types of fraud, 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. In particular, the disputed domain names have been used to impersonate the Complainant with a view to stealing cargo shipped with the Complainant.

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 names <uzbfreight.com> (<xn--uzbfreght-l5a.com>) and <uzbfrieght.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025

² www.web.archive.org/web/20231109062832/http://uzbfreight.com/ Noting its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has checked Internet archives records for the Complainant's website ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8).