

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DX Network Services Limited v. DX DELIVERY SERVICE

Case No. D2026-2859

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DX Network Services Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Howes Percival LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is DX DELIVERY SERVICE, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dxdeliveryservice.live> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 30, 2026. On July 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 2, 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 (Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 6, 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 July 13, 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 July 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 13, 2026. On August 12, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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 has operated its parcel exchange and delivery services since circa 2004, and its predecessors have operated the business since the mid1970s.

The Complainant is registered as the proprietor of numerous trademarks, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASS
DX	UK	UK00001493040	August 20, 1993	38, and 39
DX DELIVERY	UK	UK00912957189	October 31, 2014	9, 38, and 39
DX DELIVERY	European Union	012957189	October 31, 2014	9, 38, and 39

The disputed domain name was registered on May 12, 2026.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's trademarks and logos and purporting to offer delivery services.

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 as follows:

The Complainant's group is a leading provider of delivery and courier services, with a turnover exceeding GBP 500 million.

The Complainant's trademarks have been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its services. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the DX and DX DELIVERY trademarks in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates these trademarks in their entirety, and the addition of the descriptive term "service" does nothing to differentiate the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademarks.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademarks, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Rather, the disputed domain name was registered to mimic the Complainant's trademarks, as shown by the Respondent's use of the Complainant's logo on the website posted under the disputed domain name which offers the same type of services as the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademarks at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, by posting a website using the Complainant's logo and offering the same type of services as the Complainant in order to mislead customers.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, on July 13, 2026, the Respondent sent a communication in response to the Center's communication providing the Complainant with the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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 Panel finds the entirety of the DX and DX DELIVERY marks are reproduced within the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms such as here "service" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that in the present case the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".live" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 for a complainant to prove 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as, here impersonating the Complainant, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. The composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the website posted under the disputed domain name suggest a connection or implied affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent which in fact does not exist.

Based on the available record, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant’s trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant’s trademark and logo and purports to offer the same type of services, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The impression given by this website would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Moreover, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as in the present case impersonating the Complainant, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <dxdeliveryservice.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2026