

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

iVenture Solutions, Inc. v. Charles Roberson jhgfh
Case No. D2025-0202

1. The Parties

The Complainant is iVenture Solutions, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Marks Gray, P.A., United States.

The Respondent is Charles Roberson jhgfh, Argentina.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iventuresolutions.team> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 17, 2025. On January 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 20, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 27, 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 amended Complaint on January 29, 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 January 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on February 26, 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 in this administrative proceeding is iVenture Solutions, Inc., a company incorporated under the law of the State of Florida, United States. The Complainant operates in the information technology industry, offering services to businesses that include security monitoring, IT management, backup and disaster recovery, remote and on-site support, private cloud services, and expert advice.

The Complainant owns the IVENTURE trademarks, which enjoy protection through several registrations.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

United States Trademark Registration number 4,674,759 for the IVENTURE (device) trademark, registered on January 20, 2015;

United States Trademark Registration number 5,955,421 for the IVENTURE SOLUTIONS (word) trademark, registered on January 7, 2020. First use in commerce October 1, 2000.

United States Trademark Registration number 5,960,043 for the IVENTURE SOLUTIONS (word) trademark, registered on January 14, 2020. First use in commerce October 1, 2000;

United States Trademark Registration number 5,971,820 for the IVENTURE SOLUTIONS (word) trademark, registered on January 28, 2020. First use in commerce October 1, 2000.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <iventuresolutions.com> (registered on September 6, 2000).

The disputed domain name was registered on January 12, 2025.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active webpage. From the documents submitted by the Complainant it appears that the disputed name has been used to send fraudulent emails from the email address “[.....]@iventuresolutions.team” impersonating the Complainant’s talent management/recruiter.

On January 17, 2025, the Complainant sent the Respondent a cease-and-desist letter, which remains unanswered.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered trademarks; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant has further asserted and documented that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to perpetrate a phishing scheme. Specifically, the Respondent has sent emails from the address “[.....]@iventuresolutions.team” impersonating the Complainant’s talent management/recruiter.

The Complainant thus asserts that this is evidence that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that it registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a 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 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 Panel finds the Complainant's trademarks IVENTURE and IVENTURE SOLUTIONS are incorporated entirely and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed to be used to perpetrate a phishing scheme for the purposes of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel notes that, as discussed below, it is highly likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark registrations and rights to the IVENTURE and IVENTURE SOLUTIONS trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name contains, in its entirety, without any authorization or approval, the Complainant's registered trademarks.

The Complainant's trademarks and the <iventuresolutions.com> domain name were registered and used for many years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

In addition, owing to the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's trademarks, and its use to perpetrate fraud through emails sent from a misleading email address, i.e., "[.....]@iventuresolutions.team", it is clear that the Respondent was perfectly well aware of the Complainant, its trademarks and its activity when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel further notes that the use of the disputed domain name, to perpetrate fraud through emails sent from a misleading email address and signed with the name of the talent management/recruiter of the Complainant, also shows the Respondent's bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed to be used for impersonating an employee of the Complainant for the purposes of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to (nor denied) the assertions made by the Complainant both in this proceeding and in the cease-and-desist letter previously sent by the Complainant's representatives.

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 <iventuresolutions.team> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: March 12, 2025