

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Estafeta Mexicana, S.A. De C.V. v. Peter Sharapov, ShopfansRU  
Case No. DIO2025-0031

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Estafeta Mexicana, S.A. De C.V., Mexico, represented Calderón y de la Sierra y Cía., S.C., Mexico.

The Respondent is Peter Sharapov, ShopfansRU, United States of America (USA).

### **2. The Domain Name(s) and Registrar(s)**

The disputed domain name <estafeta.io> is registered with eNom, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 8, 2025. On August 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 11, 2025, 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 August 12, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 12, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 August 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir as the sole panelist in this matter on September 8, 2025. 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 Mexican company with headquarters in Mexico City, incorporated in 1979.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous ESTAFETA trademarks, including ESTAFETA trademark registered in Mexico, on April 24, 1997, under registration number 546615 for services in class 39 of International Classification ("IC"), and ESTAFETA trademark registered in Mexico on May 23, 1997, under registration number 548675 for services in class 38 of IC.

The Complainant uses its domain name <estafeta.com> to resolve to its official website, through which it informs Internet users and potential customers about its services whereby it uses its ESTAFETA trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 17, 2015, and it resolves to a website displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") links in relation to the Complainant's filed of service and that lead to external websites.

#### **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 that:

i) The Complainant has grown into one of the leading courier and logistics companies in Mexico, employing more than 12,000 people, operating a large fleet of vehicles, numerous distribution centers and logistics hubs, and its own cargo airline. It is the market leader in courier and logistics services in Mexico, offering door-to-door delivery and operating an extensive logistics network including 129 distribution centers, three logistics hubs, a fleet of approximately 5,000 vehicles, and its own cargo airline.

(ii) The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's ESTAFETA trademark, while it reproduces the ESTAFETA trademark in its entirety.

(iii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as ESTAFETA trademark ESTAFETA is the sole and exclusive property of the Complainant. The Respondent acquired and uses the disputed domain without authorization, with the intent to prevent the Complainant from obtaining it and to mislead or divert consumers from the Complainant's products and services.

(iv) The disputed domain name has been registered and is used in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its ESTAFETA trademark in the domain name. The disputed domain name could be used for illegitimate purposes such as cybersquatting, phishing, or other activities that mislead users into providing personal information, exploiting the reputation and trust associated with the ESTAFETA trademark. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has the aim of sending malicious messages or emails containing links that redirect the Internet users to websites where they are asked to provide sensitive personal information.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy prescribes that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Having in mind the similarities between the Policy and Rules on the one side, and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”) and associated rules on the other side, the Panel considers some UDRP precedents as well as the applicable sections of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), relevant to the present proceeding and will refer to them where appropriate.

### 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of ESTAFETA trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the country code Top-Level Domain (“cc TLD”) “.io” in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 under the Policy 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 3.0](#), 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.

The Respondent has not provided explanation or evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests under any of the circumstances enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Respondent has not submitted evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

In addition, previous panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

The nature of the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's ESTAFETA trademark in its entirety indicates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its ESTAFETA trademark, and creates a high risk of implied affiliation or association with the Complainant, which does not support the finding of any rights or legitimate interests in this case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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

### **C. Registered or 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.

In the present case, the disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainant's ESTAFETA trademark. Considering the notoriety and long-standing use of the Complainant's trademark, it is unlikely that the Respondent chose to register the disputed domain name by coincidence.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying ESTAFETA trademark, section titled "related searches" and PPC links in relation to the Complainant's filed of service that lead the user to the external websites. This creates a misleading impression that could cause the user to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when it is not. Having in mind the nature and use of the disputed domain name, the Panel is of opinion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name well aware of the Complainant's ESTAFETA trademark, and is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. The Complainant's ESTAFETA trademarks were registered well before the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has never received authorization from the Complainant to use its ESTAFETA trademark or to register the disputed domain name.

The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent 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 websites in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The Panel concludes that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 name <estafeta.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mladen Vukmir/*

**Mladen Vukmir**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2025