

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Estafeta Mexicana, S.A. de C.V. v. LVSSD
Case No. D2025-4933

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Estafeta Mexicana, S.A. de C.V., Mexico, represented by Calderón & De La Sierra, Mexico.

The Respondent is Enrique Collado Fernandez, LVSSD, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <estafeta.online> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 26, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 2, 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 December 2, 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 December 2, 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 December 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Mauricio Jalife Daher as the sole panelist in this matter on January 12, 2026. 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 Mexican company founded in 1979, which provides courier and logistics services in Mexico, handling millions of shipments per year.

The Complainant has developed an extensive logistics infrastructure, currently employing more than 12,400 people, with a fleet of approximately 5,000 vehicles, 129 distribution centers, three logistics hubs (San Luis Potosí, Veracruz, and Mexico City), and its own cargo airline, Estafeta Carga Aérea, which operates in both Mexico and the United States of America.

Thanks to its performance and recognition in the Mexican and international logistics sector, the Complainant has achieved consumer recognition not only through its website and advertising but also, through its registered trademarks in multiple countries (including Mexico).

The Complainant is the owner, among several others, of the following trademarks registrations in Mexico:

Reg. 546615 ESTAFETA, registered on April 24, 1997, in class 39: “collection, transport and delivery services for goods, documents and packages; tracking of documents, packages and goods via computer networks, internal networks and the internet for commercial purposes; logistics services relating to the storage, transport and delivery of goods; packaging and storage of products and packages; freight and courier services; warehouse rental, organization and handling of returned items (returns management); freight brokerage services; transport services, namely transport of products and goods by motor vehicles, trucks, railways, ships, aircraft; shipment tracking and tracing.”

Reg. 548675 ESTAFETA registered on May 23, 1997, in class 38: “communications services of all kinds.”

Reg. 2042803 ESTAFETA registered on September 26, 2019, in class 35: “advertising; online advertising for computer networks; compilation of data in computer databases; billing for third parties; consulting services in the package transportation industry; online data processing services; commercial management in the field of transportation and delivery services; provision of commercial information.”

On September 2020, the Mexican Institute of Industrial Property recognized ESTAFETA as a well-known trademark, with more than 92 trademark registrations in Mexico.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 17, 2023.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page.

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 <estafeta.online> is practically identical to its trademark ESTAFETA.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, because the registered trademark ESTAFETA, which is the substantial part of the disputed domain name, and which appears in the content of the website, is not its property. On the contrary, the registered trademark ESTAFETA is the sole and exclusive property of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <estafeta.online> has been registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. The disputed domain name reproduces entirely the ESTAFETA trademark. The Complainant contends that although the disputed domain name is not currently listed for sale or public auction, the GoDaddy search platform offers the option of hiring a manager to attempt to acquire it, which shows that the owner is open to negotiation to obtain financial gain from the Complainant trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The disputed domain name entirely includes the mark ESTAFETA.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 with 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 disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page with no content. This type of passive holding does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor does it indicate a legitimate interest.

Further, the Panel notes that, accordingly to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is purportedly located in Mexico -the same location of the Complainant. The Respondent is not commonly known under the name “Estafeta” and the composition of the disputed domain name creates a risk of user confusion with the Complainant.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, in violation of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Respondent did not file a response to the Complaint, and there is no evidence nor allegation that the Respondent makes a fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 17, 2023; 26 years after the Complainant register its trademark ESTAFETA in Mexico (1997).

The Responded has provided evidence that ESTAFETA has been recognized as a well-known trademark in Mexico.

The Panel considers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in full knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark rights and with the intention of taking advantage of such rights. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent the 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 distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name which includes the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent the finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <estafeta.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mauricio Jalife Daher/

Mauricio Jalife Daher

Sole Panelist

Date: January 26, 2026