

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bolt Technology OÜ v. Kruglov Denis Vladimirovich, OOO AleksP
Case No. D2025-3513

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bolt Technology OÜ, Estonia, represented by AAA Patendibüroo OÜ (AAA Legal Services), Estonia.

The Respondent is Kruglov Denis Vladimirovich, OOO AleksP, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <driver-bolt.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 29, 2025. On August 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 2, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 29, 2025.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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 an Estonian company, which is the owner of a super-app marketed under the trademark BOLT since 2013, which allows users to ride-hailing services, including delivery of foods and groceries, and rental of vehicles (e-scooters, e-bikes, cars).

The Complainant employs over 3,000 employees, operates in over 45 countries world-wide, and has more than 100 million users.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations of its BOLT trademark internationally, including European Union (“EU”) Registration No. 011229424, registered on April 16, 2013.

It is also the owner of EU Registration No. 018654535, registered on July 8, 2022, in respect of the trademark BOLT DRIVE.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 15, 2024, and resolves to a website which includes promotional materials found on the Complainant’s own official website (<https://bolt.eu/en-gb/driver/>). The website operated under the disputed domain name is also being used to solicit personal information (name and telephone number) from individuals seeking to become drivers for the Complainant.

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 the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in that the Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name, and the Complainant has never granted permission to the Respondent to use its BOLT trademark in connection with the registration of any domain name, or otherwise.

The Complainant also notably alleges that the disputed domain name is being deliberately used foster a false claim to affiliation with the Complainant, to the detriment of the Complainant’s business.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant’s BOLT trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The mere addition of a hyphen and the word “driver” does not detract from this finding.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel considers it implausible that the disputed domain name was adopted without the Complainant's trademark in mind, and finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name to feign affiliation with a complainant constitutes use of that domain name in bad faith. This is clearly the case in the circumstances of the present case, and the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. In particular, the attempt by the Respondent to elicit private information from individuals seeking to become drivers for the Complainant is an aggravating factor.

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 <driver-bolt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/George R. F. Souter/

George R. F. Souter

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2025