ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Kadhim Alhisnawi, Middle East Load Board
Case No. D2026-2209

1. The Parties

Complainant is Uber Technologies, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

Respondent is Kadhim Alhisnawi, Middle East Load Board, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <uberlogistic.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 22, 2026. On May 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 25, 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 (Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 26, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 26, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 18, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 2, 2026. Respondent sent email communications to the Center on June 2 and 3, 2026, confirming that the email communication sent on June 2, 2026, was Respondent's final and complete Response.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on June 9, 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

Complainant is a multinational company based in the United States. For over a decade prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered transportation and related services under the mark UBER. Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations globally for its UBER mark, as well as for other marks that contain the term UBER for services that include transportation and logistics. These include, among others, United States Registration No. 3,977,893 (registered June 14, 2011) for UBER and United States Registration No. 7,070,848 (registered June 6, 2023) for UBER FREIGHT. The former contains a translation statement: "The English translation of the term UBER in the mark is OVER." Complainant offers its logistics and transportation services via various online sites including those associated with Complainant's domain names <uberlogistics.com> and <uberfreight.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 11, 2023. Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect to a website offering competing logistics services coordinated by Respondent as "Ur Freight LLC". Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, and no authorization to use Complainant's marks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it has established rights to the UBER mark for transportation and logistics services, with over 34,000 employees operating in over 70 countries, and a listing on the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") (symbol: UBER). Complainant contends that, among its services, Complainant "manages over [USD] 20 billion of freight and one the largest networks of carriers", propelling Complainant as a member of the S&P 500 since December of 2023. Complainant further asserts that a number of UDRP panels over the past decade have found Complainant's UBER mark to be distinctive and well-known globally.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name clearly references and incorporates Complainant's UBER mark, with the addition only of the dictionary term "logistic" which "falsely implies an association" with the logistics services offered under Complainant's UBER mark. Complainant asserts that after Complainant contacted the original registrar of the disputed domain name in 2025, and obtained a ruling suspending the disputed domain name, Respondent then switched the registrar in an attempt to avoid that suspension. Complainant supports this with evidence of redirection of the disputed domain name to Respondent's website still in February 2026. Complainant further asserts that Respondent nevertheless lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, presumably for Respondent's own commercial gain, in an attempt to unfairly "disrupt" Complainant's business and extensive online customer base.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that (i) the disputed domain name is not identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent did not register and is not using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Respondent contends that, "[t]he use of the term 'uber' was not intended as a reference to the Complainant but rather arose in the context of early-stage branding exploration within the logistics industry", further arguing that "the term 'uber' has dictionary meaning (commonly 'super' or 'above')". Respondent further contends that the disputed domain name "has not been used to impersonate the Complainant" and has been used only in "good faith".

With regard to establishing rights or legitimate interest, Respondent contends that, "Respondent provides genuine freight and logistics services". Respondent contends that "[t]he domain use relates to the Respondent's business sector" and that "[t]he Respondent is commonly known by its trade name 'Ur Freight'".

Respondent argues lack of bad faith. In particular, Respondent contends that it has not attempted to "block" Complainant's mark. Rather, Respondent contends having used the disputed domain name to "redirect" to Respondent's website, offering logistics services as "Ur Freight LLC", a Washington State Limited Liability Company. Respondent explains that it "transitioned fully to a distinct and independent business identity under: Ur Freight LLC – 'www.urfreights.com'", following a trademark infringement notice received from the original registrar and hosting provider, acknowledging that this transition was necessary "to avoid any potential marketplace confusion and to ensure clear separation from third-party trademarks" which could be associated with the disputed domain name.

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. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the UBER mark, for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the UBER mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the UBER trademark in which Complainant has rights for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "logistic") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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.

Complainant has established that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's UBER mark with only the added term "logistic", which is likely to be perceived as a reference to the extensive logistics services offered by Complainant under its UBER mark. Respondent does not dispute Complainant's established rights, but rather argues that Respondent has a right and legitimate interest in promoting Respondent's own competing logistics services offered under its corporate name "Ur Freight LLC" at the website to which the disputed domain name redirects.

As noted, the term "uber" has a dictionary meaning of "over" or "above". Respondent nevertheless does not argue, and has not established, that the term "uber" is so conceptually weak for logistics services that Respondent might have a right to use the term to refer to Respondent's own logistics services that compete with those offered by Complainant under Complainant's established UBER mark. Respondent acknowledges using the disputed domain name to redirect to Respondent's own website. Previous UDRP panels have found that a respondent's use of a complainant's mark to redirect users (e.g., to a competing site) would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.3.

The Panel further considers that the composition of the disputed domain name when considered together with its use creates a risk of implied affiliation with Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent's lack of "rights or legitimate interests" in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. Respondent appears to rely on an argument of fair use.

Respondent acknowledges using the URL associated with the disputed domain name to redirect to a website offering logistics services coordinated by Respondent under its corporate name "Ur Freight LLC". These services directly compete with those offered by Complainant under its UBER mark. Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and no authorization to use Complainant's marks. Respondent has not established that Complainant's mark is so conceptually weak as to justify a need for Respondent to use Complainant's mark to refer to Respondent's competing services. Complainant has meanwhile established a high degree of commercial strength for the UBER mark, with global renown for transportation and related logistics services. Accordingly, it is apparent that Respondent was aware of these rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, having registered the disputed domain name years after the first registered UBER mark as well as upon use of the disputed domain name to redirect to Respondent's own website offering directly competing services.

Respondent was plainly aware of a notice of a trademark infringement complaint regarding the disputed domain name and its suspension in April 2025. Respondent's continued use of the disputed domain name to redirect users to its competing website until at least February 2026, despite its awareness of the trademark infringement claims and it's own acknowledgment of the potential risk of "marketplace confusion", supports a finding that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in an attempt to take unfair advantage of Complainant's identity to divert business from Complainant by attracting consumers seeking logistics services under the UBER mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <uberlogistic.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/
Lorelei Ritchie
Sole Panelist
Date: June 18, 2026