

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Estafeta Mexicana S.A. de C.V. v. Erinda osmani  
Case No. D2026-0705

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Erinda osmani, Albania.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <estafeta.team> (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 February 18, 2026. On February 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 19, 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 23, 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 February 23, 2026.

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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 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 was founded in 1979 in Mexico City, Mexico, by the German entrepreneur Gerd P. Grimm, with the vision of revolutionizing the Mexican parcel delivery market by offering the first door-to-door service in the country.

Throughout its history, the Complainant has been a pioneer in technology and innovative processes in Mexican logistics and it has also 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 ("United States").

The Complainant promotes its services on the website "www.estafeta.com".

The Complainant holds worldwide trademark registrations for ESTAFETA, such as the following:

- the Mexican trademark registration no. 548675 for ESTAFETA (device), filed on March 13, 1997, and registered on May 23, 1997, for services in the International Class 38;
- the United States trademark registration no. 1995836 for ESTAFETA (word), filed on June 1, 1993 and registered on August 20, 1996, for services in the International Class 39; and
- the German trademark registration no. 302016100778 for ESTAFETA (word), filed on January 29, 2016 and registered on February 24, 2016, for services in the International Classes 29 and 30 .

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 24, 2025, and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it resolved to an error page. Text messages that reference the Disputed Domain Name were sent to consumers.

#### **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 the following:

- due 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) and its reputation as a solid company and leader in express courier services. On September 2020, the Mexican Institute of Industrial Property recognized the ESTAFETA brand as a well-known trademark, with more than 92 trademark registrations in Mexico;
- the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar and even practically identical to the ESTAFETA trademark;

- text messages are being sent to consumers, causing them to fall into error and provide personal data and information, which can be used to commit fraud;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly because: (i) the Respondent is attempting to attract Internet users to the website corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name for commercial gain, creating confusion with the ESTAFETA trademark regarding the origin, sponsorship, affiliation, or promotion of its services. In other words, the Respondent is taking unfair advantage of the reputation and recognition of the Complainant in order to divert traffic to its website and obtain economic benefits in an illegitimate manner; (ii) 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 Respondent 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 of the ESTAFETA mark; (iii) it is important to note that a large number of people use the delivery, courier, and parcel services provided by the Complainant on a daily basis, and it has recently been observed that the Complainant's trademark has been registered as a domain name with the aim of sending malicious messages or emails containing a link that redirects the user to sites where they are asked to provide sensitive personal information that could put the Complainant's clients at risk, since they, in good faith, enter the requested information believing that they are on a website owned by the Complainant. This type of activity is commonly known as cybersquatting, typosquatting, phishing, and profit grabbing.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (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 the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used 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 mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark 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 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 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 notes the composition of the Disputed Domain Name which reproduces identically the Complainant’s trademark. Such fact, together with the other circumstances in this case, including the lack of any explanation for the choice of Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent, do not amount to a bona fide offering or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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 Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, most likely with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark, particularly because the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark exactly, and the use of the ESTAFETA trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by about 28 years and acquired reputation in its industry.

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.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an error page. UDRP 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. The Panel notes the distinctiveness and international reputation of the Complainant’s trademark; the composition of the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent’s failure to provide a response in this procedure; the implausibility of any good faith use to which the Disputed Domain Name may be put, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Sending text messages to consumers containing information about the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of committing fraud further supports a finding of bad faith.

Moreover, previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption

of bad faith for the purpose of Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1.](#), section 3.1.4.

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.team>, be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Marilena Comanescu/*

**Marilena Comanescu**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 2, 2026