

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V. v. Salman Ahmed Bajwa
Case No. D2025-4613

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Salman Ahmed Bajwa, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <estafetas.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed 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 7, 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 (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 11, 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 November 11, 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 November 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 4, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 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 in the business of providing courier and logistics services in Mexico, handling millions of shipments per year. It has operated since 1979, employs more than 12,400 people, and operates its own cargo airline in Mexico and the United States of America (“United States”) under the ESTAFETA mark.

The Complainant owns the trademark ESTAFETA and enjoys the benefits of registration in several jurisdictions, including in the United States (Reg. No. 1995836, registered on August 20, 1996).

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on January 30, 2019. The Respondent does not appear to have used the disputed domain name in connection with an active website but has made the disputed domain name available for purchase, at times through a brokerage service. As of the date of this decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar-provided page offering it for sale for USD 149,888.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contests the assertions of the Complainant on each of the three elements of the Policy. It contends that it is in the business of lawfully acquiring, holding, and developing generic and descriptive domain names as part of a legitimate domain investment activity. Under the first element, the Respondent asserts that “estafetas” is a common Spanish word, the plural of “estafeta,” with a dictionary meaning. The Respondent notes that the disputed domain name has been held by various owners, and that it hand-registered it in 2019. It contends that it has used the disputed domain name neutrally, without referencing the Complainant or its competitors. The Respondent denies knowledge of the Complainant and asserts that it did not target the Complainant in bad faith.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (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 Panel finds that the Complainant has not met its burden under all three elements.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7. 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. Id. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the ESTAFETA mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ESTAFETA mark with the addition of an "s" at the end (resulting in the plural "estafetas".) Given that the mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, the Panel finds the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the ESTAFETA mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Panels look first to whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. If so, the burden shifts to the Respondent to rebut that showing. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

On this point, the Complainant asserts that (1) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the ESTAFETA mark is not owned by the Respondent, (2) the ESTAFETA trademark is the sole and exclusive property of the Complainant, and (3) the Complainant has a superior right to the name ESTAFETA because it is reproduced verbatim in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's assertions are largely conclusory and rely solely on its ownership of a singular form of a Spanish dictionary term. The Panel has doubts whether this satisfies the prima facie standard. In any event, the Respondent's submission tips the balance in its favor.

The Respondent asserts rights and legitimate interests by showing that "estafetas" is a Spanish dictionary word for "couriers," and was selected and held for its generic meaning. The disputed domain name has not been used to impersonate or target the Complainant. Holding domain names comprising dictionary words can support legitimate interests if not used to trade off a complainant's trademark rights. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has presented a credible and supported explanation of legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not established this second element.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

To satisfy this third element under the Policy, the Complainant must prove, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has not met this burden. While the Complainant alleges that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to exploit the reputation of the ESTAFETA mark and to attract Internet users for commercial gain, these claims are not supported by evidence of targeting, impersonation, or confusion.

The word "estafetas" is a Spanish dictionary term that refers to couriers or postal relays. Panels have found that registering domain names based on dictionary words for their generic or descriptive value can be legitimate, provided the respondent does not seek to target a specific trademark owner. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1. In such cases, offering the domain name for sale does not by itself constitute bad faith.

Here, there is no specific evidence that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name because of the Complainant or its trademark. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in any way that references the Complainant, its services, or its competitors. The landing page merely offers the disputed domain name for sale, and there is no indication that the Respondent contacted the Complainant or sought to capitalize on its mark. The Complainant has not shown that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant or its rights, and nothing in the record suggests that the disputed domain name was selected for the purpose of disrupting the Complainant's business.

The Complainant's allegations of phishing or malicious use are also unsubstantiated. The Panel's review of publicly available information about the disputed domain name's configuration shows no active MX records, making it seem unlikely that the disputed domain name is being used for email-based fraud.

On this record, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has failed to establish that the disputed domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith under the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025