

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V. v. Alessandra Chillopa Lopez
Case No. D2026-0404

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Alessandra Chillopa Lopez, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <estafeta.ink> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 30, 2026. On February 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 2, 2026, 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 February 3, 2026, 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 the same date.

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 February 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on

The Center appointed Enrique Ochoa de González Argüelles as the sole panelist in this matter on March 6, 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 with headquarters in Mexico City, incorporated in 1979. Its main area of business is courier and logistic services.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous ESTAFETA trademarks in Mexico and other countries, including but not limited to:

- ESTAFETA AND LOGO trademark registered in Mexico, on April 24, 1997, under registration number 546615 for services in class 39 of International Classification ("IC") and in full force and effect until March 13, 2027, and
- ESTAFETA trademark registered in Mexico on May 23, 1997, under registration number 548675 for services in class 38 of IC and in full force and effect until March 13, 2027.

Said trademarks registrations were reviewed by the Panelist in the database of the Mexican Industrial Property Institute ("IMPI").

Several cases before the Center and IMPI have determined that ESTAFETA trademark registrations of the Complainant are well known in Mexico.

For the purposes of this Decision, ESTAFETA trademark registrations in Mexico and other jurisdictions of the Complainant will be referred to as the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS.

The Complainant uses its domain name <estafeta.com> resolving to its official website, through which it informs Internet users and potential customers about its services whereby it uses its ESTAFETA trademark.

The disputed domain name <estafeta.ink> was registered on August 17, 2025, originally with "privacy shield" scheme. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an 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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends, among others, that:

- The domain name ESTAFETA.INK is confusingly similar and even identical to ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS.
- The disputed domain name <estafeta.ink> reproduces the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS in its entirety.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, so it is clear that this domain name has been registered and acquired in bad faith.

- When entering the disputed domain name a website display appears as a page not available, however, there is evidence where they send messages as if it were the service offered by ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V.
- The Respondent registered and uses in bad faith the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP, as the domain name holder is attempting to attract Internet users to the disputed website for commercial gain, creating confusion with the ESTAFETA trademark regarding the origin, sponsorship, affiliation, or promotion of its services. In other words, the domain name holder is taking unfair advantage of the reputation and recognition of the Complainant to divert traffic to its website and obtain economic benefits in an illegitimate manner.
- Furthermore, as can be seen when searching for the domain ESTAFETA.INK, both in the search engine and through an Artificial Intelligence (AI) tool called COPILOT, the results obtained are an immediate association between ESTAFETA.INK and the Complainant, as if the owner of the registered trademark were the owner of the domain name or as if they administered it and offered products through it, a situation that is NOT the case, since, as has been demonstrated, the owner and administrator of the domain name is a person who has no direct or indirect relationship or association with ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V.
- It is clear that the owner of the domain name in question acquired the disputed domain name in bad faith, since it is clear that, knowing the international prestige of the services provided, he used this name (a registered trademark of the Complainant ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V.) without any authorization to do so and with the sole purpose of preventing the Complainant from acquiring the domain name with the ".ink" extension, where it could include its trademark and thereby prevent potential customers from accessing the products and services offered by the Complainant through digital media, both in Mexico and in other countries.
- Although the domain 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 in order to obtain financial gain from the Complainant's trademark. This conduct constitutes a clear case of registration and use in bad faith, as it hinders the commercial activity of the Complainant and diverts legitimate consumer traffic to an unauthorized site, taking advantage of the reputation built by the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS and that this type of activity is commonly known as cybersquatting, typosquatting, phishing, and profit grabbing, which leads users to believe that these acts are committed by the Complainant, a situation that is completely untrue.
- For the above reasons, this request is being submitted to prevent third parties from taking control of domain names that constitute registered trademarks that have generated trust and prestige internationally in order to carry out allegedly illegal activities in which, taking advantage of the recognition that these trademarks have generated for the Complainant in the market, they take possession of user data or information, which clearly causes serious harm both to consumers, who are under the effective protection of industrial property rights, and to the owners of the trademark registrations.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed in this administrative proceeding, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks or service marks 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 was registered and is being used in bad faith.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

Due to the lack of response from the Respondent, the Panel is prepared to draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case e.g., where a particular conclusion is *prima facie* obvious, where an explanation by the respondent is called for but is not forthcoming, or where no other plausible conclusion is apparent,, in terms of section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Furthermore, as decided in previous cases, the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".ink" is irrelevant to the make a comparison between signs for the purposes of the first element, as set out in section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

For reference see *ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V. v. Arturo Flores*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4618](#).

Consequently, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

As previously stated, the Complainant contended that the Respondent lacked any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the absence of a response from the Respondent, this assertion remained uncontested.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity to this case: sale of counterfeit goods, phishing/identity theft, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant and its activities before the registration of the disputed domain name, provided that:

- The Complainant is a very well-known company, and holder of the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS which predate over four decades the registration of the disputed domain name, being both Parties purportedly located in Mexico.
- The disputed domain name was registered to attract Internet users for commercial gain by deceiving them, which amounts to registration and use in bad faith.
- The disputed domain name was registered with a "privacy shield" scheme, which in the circumstances further affirms the Respondent's bad faith.
- The Respondent did not file a response and did not bother to present evidence of having rights in the disputed domain name.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the ESTAFETA TRADEMARKS, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity to this case: sale of counterfeit goods, phishing/identity theft, passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. In the evidence on the record, the Complainant has shown that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to send text messages impersonating the Complainant, in an attempt to retain unsuspecting consumer's data.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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.ink> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Enrique Ochoa de González Argüelles/

Enrique Ochoa de González Argüelles

Sole Panelist

Date: March 24, 2026