

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ESTAFETA MEXICANA, S.A. DE C.V. v. Saúl Ruiz González
Case No. D2026-0405

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 Saúl Ruiz González, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <estafeta.skin> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) 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 day.

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 March 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriela Kennedy 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 company providing courier and logistics services in Mexico, which claims to be handling millions of shipments per year.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the ESTAFETA mark in a few jurisdictions. The relevant trademark registrations include Mexican Trademark Registration No. 546615 for “**estafeta**” in Class 39 registered on April 24, 1997, Costa Rica Trademark Registration No. 105660 for “ESTAFETA” in Class 38 registered on February 3, 1998, and United States of America Trademark Registration No. 1995836 for “ESTAFETA” in Class 39 registered on August 20, 1996 (collectively, the “Complainant’s Trademark”).

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on September 18, 2025, many years after the Complainant registered the Complainant’s Trademark. The Complainant provided website screenshots showing the domain name <my.estafeta.skin/es/> used to resolve to a website which displayed the Complainant’s Trademark and invited Internet users to “login” by entering their email addresses in order to obtain information about their packages, including current location, shipping stages, and estimated delivery date. At the time of rendering of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name <estafeta.skin> resolved to an inactive website (the “Respondent’s 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 that:

- (a) The Disputed Domain Name is practically identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s Trademark. The Disputed Domain Name substantially reproduces the Complainant’s Trademark. The minimal difference between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant’s Trademark does not prevent the consumer, at first glance, from associating the Disputed Domain Name with the Complainant’s Trademark, leading to the confusion that the Respondent’s Website is an official website of the Complainant through which its products and/or services are offered. The Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant’s Trademark are also phonetically identical which will lead to confusion in the market.
- (b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant Trademark is the sole and exclusive property of the Complainant, who is the only person who has rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. There is a likelihood of confusion between the Complainant’s Trademark and the Disputed Domain Name, as Google Chrome and Copilot searches the Disputed Domain Name suggests that it is associated with the Complainant’s Trademark, when it is not. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name without any authorization and with the sole purpose of preventing the Complainant from acquiring the domain name with the “.com” extension.
- (c) The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name and is using it in bad faith. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s Website. The Respondent sent malicious messages or emails

containing a link that redirects users to websites where they are prompted to submit sensitive personal information, placing those users at risk, as they may reasonably believe in good faith that they are providing such information to a website owned by the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's Trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the applicable Top Level domain ("TLD") in this case ".skin" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the first element. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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.

The Panel notes that there is no evidence on the available record to show that the Respondent has trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name, or that the Respondent has become commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel further notes that the Complainant has provided no license or authorization of any kind to the Respondent to use the Complainant's Trademark or to

apply for or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's Trademark. The Respondent would likely not have adopted the Complainant's Trademark if not for the purpose of creating an impression that the Disputed Domain Name is associated with, or originates from the Complainant. The fact that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's Trademark, leads to a high risk of implied confusion as the Disputed Domain Name effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant, which is further affirmed by the Disputed Domain Name use.

There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name is in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or be regarded as legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to any active website at the time of the rendering of this Decision. The Disputed Domain Name, when deployed in the form of the third-level domain <my.estafeta.skin/es/>, purportedly resolved to a website which featured the Complainant's Trademark and claimed to provide information about courier and logistics services similar with or relating to the Complainant's business.

In the present case, the Respondent did not submit a Response. The fact that the Respondent did not submit a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. However, the Respondent's failure to file a Response may result in the Panel drawing appropriate inferences from such default. The Panel may also accept all reasonable and supported allegations and inferences flowing from the Complainant as true (see *Entertainment Shopping AG v. Nischal Soni, Sonik Technologies*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1437](#); and *Charles Jourdan Holding AG v. AAIM*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0403](#)).

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 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.

The Panel notes that it is difficult to conceive of any plausible use of the Disputed Domain Name by the unaffiliated Respondent that would amount to good faith use, given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety without authorization of the Complainant. The Disputed Domain Name <estafeta.skin>, when deployed in its third-level domain form <my.estafeta.skin/es/>, purportedly resolved to a website which featured the Complainant's Trademark and claimed to provide information about courier and logistics services similar with or relating to the Complainant's business, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website. Further, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's contentions and has provided no evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Panels have previously held that a finding of bad faith can be established where a complainant's trademark is shown to be well known or in wide use at the time of registration of the disputed domain name (see *LEGO Juris A/S v. store24hour*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0091](#)). The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and the Complainant's Trademark when registering and using the Disputed Domain Name given the well-known nature of the Complainant's business and its Trademark in the relevant industry and the fact that the Complainant's Trademark was put into use well before the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel notes that at the time of the rendering of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an inactive website. 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 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.

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.skin> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gabriela Kennedy/

Gabriela Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: March 24, 2026