

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V. v. Tsang C hoi Yan
Case No. D2025-4612

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V., Mexico, represented by Calderón & De La Sierra, Mexico.

The Respondent is Tsang C hoi Yan, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <estafetar.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 6, 2025. On November 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 10, 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 (THE INFORMATION IS PRIVATE) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 13, 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 in Spanish and English on November 14, 2025, and an amended Complaint in English on November 19, 2025.

On November 13, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On November 19, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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 Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Jacob Changjie Chen as the sole panelist in this matter on December 29, 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 was founded in 1979 in Mexico and provides door-to-door parcel delivery service. The Complainant currently employs more than 12,400 people with a fleet of approximately 5,000 vehicles, 129 distribution centers, 3 logistics hubs, and its own cargo airline which operates in both Mexico and the United States of America.

The Complainant owns several Mexican trademark registrations of ESTAFETA, including Registration No. 1070328 registered on November 4, 2008, in Class 35, and Registration No. 2042805 registered on September 26, 2019, in Class 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 19, 2024. It resolves to an inactive webpage.

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 the ESTAFETA trademark as it substantially reproduces the mark merely with the minimal difference of the letter "r".

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate rights in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including that Chinese is an uncommon language and is not a business language or a universal language of communication in international proceedings, and that conducting the proceedings in Chinese would place the Complainant at a procedural disadvantage.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 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. The mere insertion of the letter "r" after the ESTAFETA trademark is almost unnoticeable. The Panel decides such misspelling does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark. [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 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.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage. As such, there is no evidence showing that the Respondent has used or is preparing to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The non-use status also does not confer any rights or legitimate interests over the disputed domain name under 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has not provided any reasonable explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known the ESTAFETA trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. In absence of any rights or legitimate interests, registration of the disputed domain name which incorporates the Complainant's ESTAFETA trademark in its entirety suggests opportunistic bad faith and makes it appropriate for the Panel to find that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As to the use of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that it resolves to an inactive webpage. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Additionally, the Respondent did not respond to or rebut contentions of the Complainant. The Panel also notes that the Respondent has a pattern of bad faith conduct as it has registered more than one domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark. These further affirm a finding of bad faith of the Respondent in registering and using the disputed domain name.

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 <estafetar.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Jacob Changjie Chen/
Jacob Changjie Chen
Sole Panelist
Date: January 8, 2026*