

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nord-Lock Switzerland GmbH v. John Hooper, Brake Products, Inc.
Case No. D2025-3785

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nord-Lock Switzerland GmbH, Sweden, represented by Advokatfirman Lindahl KB, Sweden.

The Respondent is John Hooper, Brake Products, Inc., United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <superboltdirect.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 17, 2025. On September 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing the additional registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 19, 2025, providing the additional 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 September 24, 2025.

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 September 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 16, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on October 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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 part of the Nord-Lock Group, a global engineering organization specializing in secure bolted joint solutions. The Nord-Lock Group traces its origins to 1982 in Mattmar, northern Sweden, where the innovative wedge-locking technology was first introduced, marking the beginning of a new approach to bolt security. Over the years, the Nord-Lock Group has expanded its operations and is today wholly owned by Investment Latour AB.

Through strategic acquisitions, the Nord-Lock Group has incorporated three technology brands into its portfolio: Superbolt in 2011, Boltight in 2015, and Expander in 2016. Among these, the Superbolt mechanical multi-jackbolt tensioners (MJTs) represent a key technological innovation that enables the safe and accurate tightening of large bolts using simple hand tools.

The Complainant offers its products and has Internet presence through its official websites at “www.nord-lock.com” and “www.superbolt.com” (which redirects to “www.nord-lock.com/superbolt”), where detailed product information and online resources are available.

Moreover, the Complainant is the owner of the trademark SUPERBOLT in many jurisdictions, including European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) Reg. No. 000747147, registered since September 5, 2002, in class 6; EUIPO Reg. No. 015999857, registered since April 10, 2017, in classes 6, 7, 8, and 37; United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) Reg. No. 1618412, registered since October 23, 1990, in class 6; and International Registration No. 1360834, registered since May 3, 2017, in classes 6 and 7, designating, for example, Australia, Norway, and Japan.

The Complainant holds registrations for the mark SUPERBOLT that predate the registration of the disputed domain name, including in the United States (the Respondent’s jurisdiction). The Complainant’s earliest registration for SUPERBOLT dates to October 23, 1990.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the website corresponding to the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage displaying the Complainant’s trademark and offering various industrial products, including the Complainant’s products. However, it currently resolves to an inactive page displaying the message “COULD NOT CONNECT. Could not connect to the requested server host”.

According to the Complaint, the Respondent is a customer of the Complainant. The relationship between the Parties is strictly confined to a buyer–seller arrangement and does not involve any form of distributorship or authorization to use the Complainant’s trademarks or to register any domain names.

Lastly, the disputed domain name was registered on September 22, 2013.

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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark SUPERBOLT in which the Complainant has prior rights.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name . The Complainant is not related to the Respondent in any way and has not established any activity and/or business with the Respondent. More specifically, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent is merely a customer of the Complainant. The Respondent is not an official distributor of the Complainant's products, nor has the Complainant granted the Respondent any license, authorization, or consent to use or register the SUPERBOLT trademark or any domain name incorporating that mark. The Complainant has sold Superbolt-branded products to the Respondent from time to time, but such commercial transactions did not confer upon the Respondent any rights in respect of the trademark or the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Complainant sustains that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith to create confusion among potential purchasers, misleading them into believing that the Respondent's website is affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant. Particularly, the Complainant received an email communication from a customer referring to a specific product of the Complainant sold on the Respondent's website.

The Complainant tried to contact the Respondent, aiming at resolving this matter amicably outside of this administrative proceeding, but did not obtain any reply.

Finally, the Complainant requests the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding that <superboltdirect.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

Although the Respondent submitted a Response using the Model Response provided by the Center following the commencement of this administrative proceeding, such filing consists solely of the Respondent's contact details and a signature at the end of the document, with an email attachment showing the Registrar's reply to the Respondent indicating that the disputed domain name has been locked due to a dispute and could not be transferred. The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions, and did not include any factual statements, evidence, or arguments addressing the substance of the Complaint or establishing any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel considers that the Respondent has not effectively exercised its right to respond to the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar with a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy, in accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Disregarding the Top-Level Domain ".com", as set forth in section 1.11.1 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the only difference between the Complainant's registered trademark and the disputed domain name is the addition of the term "direct".

It is well established in prior UDRP decisions that the mere addition of a term to a complainant's mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. For instance, in *LinkedIn Corporation v. Daphne Reynolds*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1679](#), the panel found that the addition of the descriptive term "jobs" to the complainant's trademark LINKEDIN did not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Similarly, in the present case, the inclusion of the word "direct", which may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 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 Complainant has claimed not to have authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the SUPERBOLT trademark nor is there any other evidence in the file suggesting that the Respondent has or could have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Also, the Complainant has prior rights in the SUPERBOLT trademark which clearly precedes the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.

Likewise, the Respondent has not made or is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The evidence shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and offering industrial products, including the Complainant's SUPERBOLT products, thereby seeking to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. At present, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page displaying the message "COULD NOT CONNECT. Could not connect to the requested server host". This evidences that the Respondent has not demonstrated any legitimate use of the disputed domain name or any bona fide offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the additional term “direct” in the disputed domain name is a common commercial expression referring to direct purchase or delivery, which does not confer any distinctiveness. On the contrary, it increases the likelihood of confusion by suggesting that the disputed domain name is an official or authorized sales channel of the Complainant, contrary to the fact.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent intentionally seeks to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website and the products offered therein. By reproducing the Complainant’s mark in its entirety and merely adding the term “direct”, the Respondent gives the misleading impression of operating an official or authorized sales channel of the Complainant. This conduct is clearly aimed at diverting potential customers away from the Complainant’s official website to the Respondent’s own online platform, thereby taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s reputation and goodwill.

Furthermore, the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s trademark and logo in their entirety on the website associated with the disputed domain name further supports the finding of bad faith. Such use reinforces the false impression that the Respondent’s website is operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant, particularly noting the website also offered for sale the Complainant’s products.

In addition, the Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the trademark SUPERBOLT is widely known and was registered and used many years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. When registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent has targeted the Complainant’s trademark SUPERBOLT to create confusion among Internet users and benefit from the Complainant’s reputation. Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that, when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, it must have been aware of the Complainant and the Complainant’s trademark SUPERBOLT – which has been registered since 1990 in the United States, where the Respondent is domiciled according to the case record. Consequently, and in accordance with section 3.1.4 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s widely-known trademark and was registered by the Respondent who is not affiliated with the Complainant, creates a presumption that the disputed domain name was registered on a bad faith basis.

Even more, according to the Complaint, the Respondent has ignored the cease-and-desist letter from the Complainant, which aimed at resolving this matter amicably outside of this administrative proceeding.

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 <superboltdirect.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: November 5, 2025