

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc. v. Quang Nguyen Thien Bang Case No. D2026-0720

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, L.L.P., United States.

The Respondent is Quang Nguyen Thien Bang, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <olddominionfreightlineinc.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 19, 2026. On February 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 23, 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 (Unknown) 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 amended Complaint on February 23, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 18, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 27, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on March 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder 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, Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc., is a United States-based company founded in 1934 and is one of the largest North American less-than-truckload (LTL) motor carriers. The Complainant provides regional, inter-regional, and national freight transportation services through an extensive network across the United States.

The Complainant has used the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark since as early as 1954 and details of some of the Complainant's trademark registrations are as below:

- OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE - US Registration No. 4316040, registered on April 9, 2013, in International Class 39;
- OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE - Canada Registration No. TMA874302, registered on March 27, 2014, in International Class 39; and
- OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE - Mexico Registration No. 1354919, registered on March 15, 2013, in International Class 39.

The Complainant operates through its official website at "www.odfl.com", which was registered on July 3, 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 13, 2026. The disputed domain name initially resolved to an active website that impersonated the Complainant by reproducing its name, address, providing the same type of logistic services and holding itself out as the Complainant. The Respondent also configured email servers associated with the disputed domain name.

Following a takedown request by the Complainant, the website content was removed, and the disputed domain name currently resolves to a placeholder 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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name incorporates the mark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "inc", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant asserts that it owns registered trademark rights in OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE, including a United States trademark registration, and that it has used the mark for several decades in connection with its freight transportation services.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no business or legal relationship with the Complainant and has not been authorised or licensed to use the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name was used to host a website impersonating the

Complainant, reproducing its name and address, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its well-known trademark and intentionally used it to impersonate the Complainant. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent configured email servers associated with the disputed domain name, creating a risk of fraudulent communications. In light of these circumstances, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. It sent an email communication on February 27, 2026 expressing its willingness to transfer the disputed domain name "in exchange for a settlement amount of USD 1,000".

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 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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark. The addition of the term "inc", being a common corporate identifier, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's mark remains clearly recognisable within the disputed domain name, and such addition does not create any meaningful distinction. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that 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 rests with the Complainant, panels recognise the difficulty of proving a negative. Where a complainant establishes a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the respondent. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant, is not affiliated with its business, and has not been authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent.

The Panel observes that the Respondent's website was impersonating the Complainant, reproducing its identity and presenting itself as the Complainant. Such conduct does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

The Panel further finds that the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety along with its corporate identifier, carries a clear risk of implied affiliation, which cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

In addition, the Respondent configured email servers associated with the disputed domain name. In the absence of any legitimate purpose, and in light of the impersonation, this supports a risk of deceptive or fraudulent use. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for passing off or other illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that 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) sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may evidence bad faith registration and use.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's distinctive OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark together with the term "inc", which corresponds to the Complainant's corporate name. The Panel finds that such a composition is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is connected with or affiliated to the Complainant. The registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark by an unrelated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel observes that the Respondent's website actively replicated the Complainant's identity — reproducing its name, address, and services — to attract Internet users for commercial gain. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which contemplates intentional use of a domain name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive framework for bad faith, and other relevant circumstances may also be considered. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent configured email servers for the disputed domain name, which supports a finding that the domain name may be used for fraudulent communications or impersonation. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name to host a copycat version of the complainant's website to send deceptive emails constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The Panel also observes that the Respondent failed to submit a formal response. While non-participation does not by itself establish bad faith, it permits the Panel to draw adverse inferences from the record and to accept the Complainant's reasonable contentions as established. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <olddominionfreightlineinc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/

Shwetasree Majumder

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2026