

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bellhop, Inc. v. Maksim Elishaev
Case No. D2026-0795

1. The Parties

Complainant is Bellhop, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by IPLA, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Maksim Elishaev, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bellhopmovingatl.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 25, 2026. On February 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On February 26, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (The RDAP server redacted the value / Unlisted, HOSTINGER operations, UAB (Registrar)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 26, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 3, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on March 30, 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

Since 2014, Complainant has served over 300,000 customers across more than 70 cities for various moving, relocation, transport, delivery, storage, and furniture/equipment installation services in the United States. Apart from Complainant's website, the "Bellhop Goods and Services" are also accessible and schedulable through Complainant's Bellhop mobile app.

Complainant owns registered trademarks for the BELLHOP and BELLHOPS marks, including:

- United States registered trademark number 6859956 for the BELLHOP word mark, registered on September 27, 2022; and
- United States registered trademark number 4747947 for the BELLHOPS word mark, registered on June 2, 2015.

Complainant also owns and operates its website at the domain name <getbellhops.com>, registered on December 10, 2013.

The Domain Name was registered on November 4, 2025 and resolves to a website that purportedly offers moving services, and uses Complainant's mark and prior address.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for BELLHOP and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name, with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for Complainant's bona fide and well-known services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name which includes Complainant's trademark, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights. Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondent used the Domain Name to pose as Complainant, confuse customers, and offer competing services.

Complainant also notes that it contacted the phone number listed on Respondent's website, indicating that a representative of Respondent answered and confirmed that they would take down the infringing website. However, Complainant notes that no subsequent actions were taken. Complainant had also attempted to serve a formal cease-and-desist letter on Respondent via the email addresses listed on Respondent's website, but the record shows that all emails were returned as undeliverable.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") states that failure to respond to complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the BELLHOP trademark, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the BELLHOP trademark.

With Complainant's rights in the BELLHOP trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain in which it was registered (in this case, ".com"), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's BELLHOP trademark. The BELLHOP trademark is recognizable in the Domain Name. The addition of the terms "moving" and "atl" (generally understood to be an abbreviation for "Atlanta") after Complainant's BELLHOP trademark in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the BELLHOP trademark. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its BELLHOP trademark and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the BELLHOP trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating this trademark.

Respondent is also not known to be associated with the BELLHOP trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that the Domain Name resolved to a website that offered moving services that were directly competitive to Complainant's business services. The record also showed that Respondent used Complainant's mark and prior Atlanta address as Respondent's formal address on its website, giving the appearance that its service offerings were associated with or sponsored by Complainant.

UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegitimate activity — such as impersonation, or passing off as in this case — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the BELLHOP trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant's BELLHOP trademark and related services are known and recognized for purposes of the Policy. Therefore, and also noting the use analysis below, the Panel finds on balance that Respondent was clearly aware of the BELLHOP trademark when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for bona fide and well-known BELLHOP products and services of Complainant. In particular, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the record shows that Respondent offered moving services that were directly competitive to Complainant's services, and used Complainant's mark and prior Atlanta address as its formal address on its website, giving the false appearance that Respondent's service offerings were associated with or sponsored by Complainant. The record further shows that Complainant had received phone calls from confused customers that mistakenly believed Respondent's website was that of Complainant and had booked Respondent's services believing it to be Complainant's business.

Therefore, by using the Domain Name featuring Complainant's trademark, and then further to promote its business by inducing members of the public to pay for these imitated or impersonated services, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's BELLHOP marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website. All these actions may result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill in the industry.

UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent's use of a domain name to trade off goodwill in a complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate complainant, as here, constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4158](#). Moreover, such use of the Domain Name may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the BELLHOP trademark, and Respondent's use of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <bellhopmovingatl.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026