ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Akkadian Ventures, Inc. v. Aman Sajid, Cold IQ LLC
Case No. D2026-2162

1. The Parties

Complainant is Akkadian Ventures, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

Respondent is Aman Sajid, Cold IQ LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <getraiseglobal.com>, <meetraiseglobal.com>, <openraiseglobal.com>, <tryraiseglobal.com>, and <useraiseglobal.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 19, 2026. On May 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 22, 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 June 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 21, 2026. Respondent sent email communications to the Center on June 4 and 16, 2026 stating its willingness to settle and consent to transfer the disputed domain names to Complainant. After Complainant´s request, the proceeding was suspended on June 19, 2026, and following no response by Respondent to settlement documents forwarded from Complainant, the proceeding was reinstated on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Scott R. Austin as the sole panelist in this matter on August 24, 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

Without contest by Respondent, Complainant asserts in its Complaint, as amended, and in its attached annexes provides sufficient evidence to support that:
Complainant, Akkadian Ventures, Inc., is a private investment firm founded in 2010 and incorporated in Delaware, United States that organizes and conducts business conferences in the field of venture capital under the service marks RAISE and RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT (collectively the “RAISE Marks”). Complainant operates in the venture capital and startup industry, connecting founders, investors, and industry leaders through curated events, advisory services, and investment initiatives. As of September 2025, Complainant reports USD 1.27 billion in assets under management and a portfolio of 97 companies.

A central component of Complainant’s business is an international conference series organized annually since 2016 for entrepreneurs, venture capitalists, and other participants in the startup community marketed under the trademark RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT (the “RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT Mark”). Complainant operates the official website for the RAISE Global Summit at “www.raiseglobal.co” (the “Official RAISE Global Website”).

Complainant owns trademark registrations for the RAISE Marks, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 7,309,827, RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT, registered on February 20, 2024, for services in International Class 41. The registration disclaims “GLOBAL SUMMIT” apart from the mark as shown;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00004080217, RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT, registered on October 18, 2024, in International Class 41; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7,309,824, RAISE (stylized), registered on February 20, 2024, for services in International Class 41. The registration depicts the word RAISE using a stylized font.

Respondent registered all five disputed domain names <getraiseglobal.com>, <meetraiseglobal.com>, <openraiseglobal.com>, <tryraiseglobal.com>, and <useraiseglobal.com> with the same registrar on the same day, March 12, 2025. The disputed domain name registrations therefore postdate Complainant’s above United States trademark registrations by more than one year.

At the time of the Complaint, each disputed domain name redirected Internet users to Complainant’s Official RAISE Global Website, and each was enabled for email communication as their DNS zone files were configured with Mail eXchanger (“MX”) and Sender Policy Framework (“SPF”) records.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

Respondent provided no formal response to Complainant’s contentions. Respondent sent informal email communications to the Center on June 4 and 16, 2026 stating its willingness to settle and consent to transfer the disputed domain names to Complainant. After the proceeding was suspended on June 19, 2026, at Complainant’s request, but following no response by Respondent to settlement documents forwarded from Complainant the proceeding was reinstated on August 20, 2026.

More specifically, on June 4, 2026, Respondent stated:

"ColdIQ is an outbound marketing agency. A core part of what we do is set up email infrastructure for clients. This involves registering sending domains and connecting inboxes to outreach platforms, in the same way we run our own domains such as trycoldiq.com, meetcoldiq.com and usecoldiq.com. We register the domains, configure the inboxes, and connect them to the outreach platform based on the client's requirements, and we only proceed once the client has approved.

In this instance we were providing this infrastructure support to a partner agency whose client is Raise Summit. Raise Summit requested a set of domains for their campaigns and specifically asked that the keyword "global" be used. The six domains listed above were registered to fulfil that request.

Since receiving notice of these proceedings we have tried to reach the relevant parties to obtain a clear answer and to assist in withdrawing or resolving the matter, but we have not been able to make contact with them.

We have no interest in retaining these domains and no objection to the relief sought. We are willing to cancel the infrastructure we set up, and we provide our unambiguous consent to the transfer of all six domain names listed above to the Complainant, Akkadian Ventures, Inc.

We are happy to cooperate fully with whatever steps the Center, the Complainant's representative, and the registrar require to give effect to the transfer, including providing any authorization or transfer codes once instructed. Please let us know the next steps."

6. Discussion and Findings

In view of Respondent's failure to submit any Response, the Panel shall decide these administrative proceedings on the basis of Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations and inferences set forth in the Complaint as true unless the evidence is clearly contradictory. See *Talk City, Inc. v. Michael Robertson*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0009; see also *Microsoft Corporation v. Freak Films Oy*, WIPO Case No. D2003-0109.

Where no Response is filed, however, Complainant must still make out its case in all respects under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. To succeed, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied.

The Panel will address its findings on each of these requirements in more detail below.

The standard of proof under the Policy is often expressed as the "balance of the probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard. Under this standard, an asserting party needs to establish that it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.2.

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Complainant has demonstrated registered rights in the RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT and RAISE marks. Ownership of a registered trademark generally satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel notes that Complainant's United States RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT registration disclaims "GLOBAL SUMMIT" apart from the mark as shown, and that Complainant's RAISE registration uses a stylized font and includes a stylized letter "R". These features do not prevent Complainant from establishing standing here. In assessing confusing similarity, panels generally compare the alphanumeric domain name with the textual components of the relevant mark and largely disregard design elements incapable of representation in a domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.10. In each disputed domain name, the textual element RAISE GLOBAL is plainly recognizable.

Each disputed domain name incorporates the textual components of the RAISE Mark in its entirety and combines it with the term "global", forming the predominant portion of the RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT Mark, and appending the combined terms with one of five prefixes - "get", "meet", "open", "try", or "use". The addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the relevant trademark remains recognizable in the disputed domain names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration technical requirement and may be disregarded for purposes of the first-element comparison. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to trademarks in which Complainant has rights and that Complainant has established the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exclusive list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. Although the overall burden of proof remains on Complainant, once Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating such rights or legitimate interests. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1. See also, *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. D2008-1393.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established such a prima facie case. Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT or RAISE marks or to register domain names incorporating those marks. There is no evidence that Respondent, identified by the Registrar as "Aman Sajid, Cold IQ LLC," has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names or by "raise" or "raise global". WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.3.

Nor does the record support a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Each disputed domain name redirected to Complainant's Official RAISE Global Website. Such redirection, without Complainant's authorization, confirms that the disputed domain names were selected with Complainant and its marks in mind and does not constitute a bona fide offering or fair use, nor give to Respondent a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names. See *CSC Holdings, Inc. v. cablevision-lightpath.com Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2004-1057. The composition and use of the disputed domain names also create a risk of implied affiliation with Complainant rather than a clear distinction from it. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.2. See also *Suncor Energy Inc. v. Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc. / andre bechamp*, WIPO Case No. D2012-2123.

Complainant also shows the MX and SPF records for each of the disputed domain names are configured for email use. In the circumstances of this case, where the disputed domain names incorporate Complainant's RAISE Mark and redirect users to Complainant's Official RAISE Global Website reinforcing implied affiliation and enhancing Respondent's impersonation of Complainant, the Panel finds it implausible to believe that emails originating from the disputed domain names could do anything other than confuse or mislead Complainant's employees, business partners, agencies or clients. Use of the disputed domain names for email services, therefore, would not give the Respondent rights or a legitimate interest in the disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.2. See also *CSC Holdings, Inc. v. cablevision-lightpath.com Inc, supra; Arnold Clark Automobiles Limited v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico,* WIPO Case No. D2021-3924.

Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with evidence of any circumstance contemplated by paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise establishing rights or legitimate interests. The Panel therefore finds that Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

For purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) sets out non-exclusive circumstances that constitute evidence of registration and use in bad faith. Bad faith is broadly understood to arise where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark, and panels may infer intent from the totality of the facts and circumstances. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.1 and 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the disputed domain names with actual knowledge of and with the intention of targeting Complainant and its marks. Complainant's United States registrations for RAISE GLOBAL SUMMIT and RAISE predate the March 12, 2025, registrations of the disputed domain names by more than one year. More significantly, each disputed domain name was configured to redirect Internet users to Complainant's Official RAISE Global Website. That redirection is compelling evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant and deliberately selected the disputed domain names because of their association with Complainant's RAISE Mark and the terms comprising the URL for the Official RAISE Global Website. The timing of the registrations before Complainant's October 23, 2025, RAISE Global Summit provides additional contextual support for targeting. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The same redirections also support a finding of bad-faith use. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4 recognizes, among the evidence relevant to bad faith based on confusion, redirection of a disputed domain name to the complainant's own website. See *International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) v. Tyler Dikman*, WIPO Case No. D2025-2376. Respondent, therefore, rather than Complainant, retains control of the disputed domain names and therefore retains the ability to alter the redirection. See *CSC Holdings, Inc. v. cablevision-lightpath.com Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2004-1057.

The DNS configuration provides further support for the Panel's conclusion. Each disputed domain name has MX and SPF records and therefore is capable of being used for email communications. The record does not establish that Respondent actually sent phishing or fraudulent emails, and the Panel does not make such a finding. Nevertheless, prior panels assessing similar facts have recognized that with email enabled disputed domain names, "the mere presence of mail servers and SPF records represents a severe risk of phishing or other fraudulent and abusive activities". Together with other evidence in the record here, such as redirection and confusing similarity to the complainant's mark, supports an inference of bad faith on Respondent's side. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. *Arnold Clark Automobiles Limited v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico*, *supra*; see also *Publix Asset Management Company v. WhoisGuard, Inc. / Entrep, David Levey / Mr. Dunaway*, WIPO Case No. D2013-1349.

Finally the Panel adds to the foregoing facts, evidence provided in a recent prior decision of the Panel involving the same Complainant, Complainant Mark, and Respondent, finding in favor of Complainant of each of the elements of the Policy based on a similar record of Respondent's conduct constituting bad faith under Policy ¶ 4(b)(ii) where the respondent registered a domain name to prevent the trademark owner from reflecting its mark in a corresponding domain name, provided the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct – in this case a total of nine disputed domain names between the two decisions. See *Akkadian Ventures, Inc. v. Aman Sajid, Cold IQ LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2026-2075.

Considering cumulatively the confusing composition of five domain names targeting Complainant's RAISE Mark, their registration after Complainant acquired trademark rights, their redirection to Complainant's official website, the MX and SPF email configuration, and Respondent's failure to provide any explanation or evidence of good-faith use, the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Complainant has therefore 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 names <getraiseglobal.com>, <meetraiseglobal.com>, <openraiseglobal.com>, <tryraiseglobal.com>, and <useraiseglobal.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Scott R. Austin/
Scott R. Austin
Sole Panelist
Date: September 7, 2026