

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc. v. Grist Truck Brokers Inc Grist, Ashhad Ur Rehman, Lakeysha Hamilton
Case No. D2026-2393

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc., United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP, United States.

The Respondents are Grist Truck Brokers Inc Grist, United States; Ashhad Ur Rehman, Pakistan; and Lakeysha Hamilton, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <olddominionfreightline.info> and <olddominionfreightline.com> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB.

The disputed domain name <olddominionfrieghtline.com> is registered with IONOS SE (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 2, 2026. On June 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 3, 2026, and June 5, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted, The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 8, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 8, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 “Less than Truckload” (“LTL”) motor carrier providing regional, inter-regional, and national LTL services across the United States and Canada. Its services include expedited transportation, container drayage, truckload brokerage, and supply chain consulting. The Complainant has used the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark in connection with its services since 1954 and owns U.S. Trademark Registration Number 4316040 for the mark, registered on April 9, 2013. The Complainant operates 216 service centers and employs approximately 21,000 people. The Complainant is listed on the Nasdaq Stock Market and reported revenues of approximately 5.8 billion USD in 2025.

Based on information provided by the Registrar, the Respondents are: for <olddominionfrieghtline.com>, Lakeysa Hamilton with an address in the United States; for <olddominionfreightline.info>, GRIST TRUCK BROKERS INC Grist with an address in the United States, and <olddominionfreiightline.com>, Ashhad Ur Rehman with an address in Pakistan.

The disputed domain names <olddominionfrieghtline.com>, <olddominionfreightline.info>, and <olddominionfreiightline.com> were registered on May 19, 2026, May 24, 2026, and February 13, 2026, respectively. Disputed domain names <olddominionfrieghtline.com> and <olddominionfreiightline.com> do not resolve to any website with active content, while <olddominionfreightline.info> resolves to a Registrar landing page.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that disputed domain name <olddominionfreightline.info> is identical to the Complainant’s OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark as it incorporates the mark in its entirety. As for the other two disputed domain names, the Complainant contends that they also incorporate the Complainant’s mark in its entirety with only small changes (reversed “i” and “e” in <olddominionfrieghtline.com> and an extra “i” and removal of one “d” in <olddominionfreiightline.com>) and are therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondents in any respect. The Complainant further contends that there is no evidence of the Respondents’ use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in providing any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor

any evidence that the Respondents have been commonly known by the disputed domain names or is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of them.

Finally, the Complainant contends that its OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark is highly distinctive and well-known, making it unlikely that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names by chance, without targeting the Complainant or its mark. The Complainant also contends that despite the Respondents' passive holding of the disputed domain names, bad faith use can be found given the reputation of the Complainant's mark, the lack of any response from the Respondent, the Respondent's use of a privacy service, the fact that MX servers are set up for <olddominionfrieghtline.com>, and the implausibility of any good faith use for the disputed domain names.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names all incorporate the OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE mark in its entirety with only minor typographical variations in two of the disputed domain names. In addition, the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period of time – approximately three months of one another – and all have been passively held. Finally, two of the disputed domain names are registered to the same Registrar.

For the reasons above, the Panel is of the view that all three disputed domain names are more likely than not under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. Besides, none of the Respondents submitted any arguments to the contrary.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 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.

First, the disputed domain name <olddominionfreightline.info> is identical to the Complainant's mark because it incorporates the mark in its entirety. The other two disputed domain names are confusingly similar because they contain the Complainant's mark with only minor typographical errors—namely, the transposition of the letters “e” and “i” in <olddominionfrieghtline.com> and the omission of one “d” and the addition of an extra “i” in <olddominionfreiightline.com>. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In addition, previous UDRP panels have concluded that a domain name that consists of a variation of a trademark, such as a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, is considered confusingly similar to the relevant trademark for the purposes of the first element and is referred to as typosquatting. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain names <olddominionfrieghtline.com> and <olddominionfreiightline.com> should be viewed as typosquatting and confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

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.

Moreover, prior UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the disputed domain name <olddominionfreightline.info> is identical to the Complainant's mark, and as such, it is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that it is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

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.

First, the Panel finds that the Complainant's mark OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE is distinctive and well-known. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Here, the disputed domain names are either identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, and therefore, there is a presumption of bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

Moreover, the Complainant has provided evidence that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name <olddominionfrieghtline.com>, demonstrating that the disputed domain name is capable of receiving email communications and increasing the risk of deceptive or fraudulent email use. This presents an implied ongoing threat to the Complainant and further supports a finding of bad faith under these circumstances.

There is no evidence that the disputed domain names were ever used by the Respondent. But panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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 and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the lack of any response from the Respondent, and in light of the nature of the disputed domain names finds it implausible that the disputed domain names may be put into any good faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names 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 names <olddominionfreightline.info>, <olddominionfrieghtline.com>, and <olddominionfrieghtline.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: July 10, 2026