

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nexus Logistics S.A. v. Hans Rodrigo Troncoso
Case No. D2026-1473

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nexus Logistics S.A., Chile, represented by Magliona Abogados, Chile.

The Respondent is Hans Rodrigo Troncoso, Chile and United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <nexuslogistics.com> is registered with TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd.

The disputed domain name <nl nexus.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in Spanish with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 7, 2026. On April 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 9, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center informed the parties in English and Spanish, that the language of the registration agreements for the disputed domain names is English. On April 14, 2026, the Complainant submitted the Complaint translated into English.

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 April 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Felipe Claro as the sole panelist in this matter on May 15, 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.

The Panel noted that the Complainant in its Complaint has incorrectly referred in section “III. The Domain Name(s) and Registrar(s)” to the Registrars of the disputed domain names. For this reason, pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel requested to the Complainant to amend the Complaint in order to correctly reflect the registrar information of each of the disputed domain names. The Complainant submitted the amended Complaint on May 22, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company specializing in domestic and international air, sea, and land freight services, offering door-to-door import and export logistics solutions.

The Complainant has over 30 years of experience, providing comprehensive, customized and trusted logistics solutions to its clients.

The Complainant has offices in Chile, Argentina, Peru, Colombia, and the United States of America. Additionally, it has a network spanning 189 countries, providing global coverage and serving more than 1,200 active clients.

The Complainant is the owner in Chile of the trademark registrations listed below, among others:

- Word mark: NEXUS, registration No. 664819 (now No. 1029995), May 12, 2003, class 39.
- Word mark: NL NEXUS LOGISTICS, registration No. 1414306, November 8, 2023, class 39.
- Device mark: NL NEXUS LOGISTICS, registration No. 1414307, November 8, 2023, class 39.

The Respondent acted as a provider of IT and domain-related services to the Complainant over an extended period, under the position of regional systems manager (“Gerente Regional de Sistemas”). The Respondent used a corporate email address associated with the Complainant’s domain name “@nl nexus”. The Complainant changed its email address to “@nexuslogisticsglobal.com” as a result of being blocked.

The Panel notes evidence showing that the Respondent registered domain names corresponding to the Complainant’s business (including “.cl” domain names) and later transferred those to the Complainant upon request in 2022.

The disputed domain name <nexuslogistics.com> was registered in 2010 and the disputed domain name <nl nexus.com> in 2015.

The disputed domain names were used in connection with the Complainant’s operations until early 2026, after which the Complainant lost access to them. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name <nexuslogistics.com> resolved to a suspended page and, the disputed domain name <nl nexus.com>, to a WordPress website with the legend: “Mente despierta: un blog sobre filosofía”. Currently, the content of the disputed domain name <nexuslogistics.com> has been restored and, the disputed domain name <nl nexus.com>, 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 names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In view of the lack of a formal response and supporting evidence by the Respondent as required under paragraph 5 of the Rules, the Panel may draw inferences from this circumstance as it considers appropriate, but will regardless weigh all available evidence available in the case file. Under paragraphs 5(e), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel is directed to decide this administrative proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed representations. In that regard the Panel makes the following specific findings.

A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is English. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was translated into and filed in English. The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding. Having considered the above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

B. 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 NEXUS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar 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.

C. 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.

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.

Between the Parties existed a longstanding commercial relationship, during which the Respondent was a trusted provider of technological and IT support services to the Complainant, including the management of domain names and websites. In the Panel’s view, this conduct indicates that the Respondent registered and managed domain names in the context of his relationship with the Complainant, rather than for his own independent rights or interests. The record further shows that the disputed domain names were used in connection with the Complainant’s operations until early 2026, after which the Complainant lost access to them.

In September 2022, the Complainant requested the Respondent the transfer of all Nexus-related domain names globally (“todos los que tengas relacionados a Nexus a nivel global”), which was partially done by the Respondent (he only transferred those under the ccTLD “.cl”). There is no reason to treat the Nexus ccTLD domain names differently from the gTLD ones. The Panel finds that the Respondent continued to retain the Nexus gTLD disputed domain names, despite lacking any right or legitimate interest in them.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent requested USD 334.142 to transfer the disputed domain names to the Complainant, which was refused by the Respondent. The Respondent has not rebutted this contention.

In the absence of any evidence that the Respondent was authorized to register the disputed domain names in his own name, the Panel finds on balance that the Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

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

D. 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.

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.

The Panel finds that the evidence on the record establishes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith. The following circumstances are particularly relevant:

The Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain names. The disputed domain name <nexuslogistics.com> was registered on October 11, 2010, and the disputed domain name <nl nexus.com> was registered on June 9, 2015.

The Complainant's earliest trademark, NEXUS (registration No. 664819), dates from 2003 and thus predates the registration of both disputed domain names. The Respondent, as the Complainant's trusted IT service provider for over twenty years, had full knowledge of the existence of the Complainant and its trademarks, including the critical importance of the domain names for the Complainant's daily business operations.

The Respondent's position as the Complainant's exclusive IT administrator and technological custodian - holding total administration and absolute control over all of the Complainant's critical technological infrastructure - gave the Respondent privileged access and knowledge that he exploited by registering the disputed domain names in his own name rather than in the name of the Complainant, for whose benefit the disputed domain names were intended to operate. Absent any evidence that the Complainant authorized or consented to the registration of the disputed domain names in the Respondent's personal name, the Panel finds, on balance, that such conduct is more consistent with bad faith than with an innocent oversight on the Respondent's part. The Respondent used a corporate email address ([...])@nl nexus.com) and his signature block included the word "nexus", demonstrating his awareness of and connection to the Complainant's marks.

The Respondent's prior conduct with respect to the equivalent ccTLD ".cl" domain names (<nl nexus.cl> and <nexuslogistics.cl>) confirms the pattern of bad faith. On May 14, 2018, the Respondent registered those domain names in his own name. When the Complainant discovered this situation in September 2022 and requested the transfer of all Nexus-related domain names globally, the Respondent transferred the ccTLD ".cl" domain names to the Complainant but retained the gTLD ".com" disputed domain names under his own registration, without any legitimate justification.

While the Panel does not rely on paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy as the primary basis for its finding of bad faith, the Respondent's subsequent demand for USD 334,142 as a condition for the return of the disputed domain names and the restoration of access to the Complainant's email and web services - an amount wholly disproportionate to any legitimate out-of-pocket costs - is not without relevance. Taken together with the Respondent registering the disputed domain names in his own name rather than the Complainant's, this demand serves to colour the Respondent's intentions at the time of registration and reinforces the Panel's finding, on balance, that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names <nexuslogistics.com> and <nl nexus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Felipe Claro/

Felipe Claro

Sole Panelist

Date: May 29, 2026