

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Outreach Corporation v. Collette Rutherford, Outreachly
Case No. DIO2025-0058

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Outreach Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented Perkins Coie, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Collette Rutherford, Outreachly, France, represented by Sigman, Khan & Chubb, PLLC, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <outreachly.io> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 22, 2025. On December 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 26, 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, Outreachly) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 29, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 26, 2026. On January 15, 2026, the Respondent contacted the Center, requesting an extension under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, which the Center granted on the same day. On January 19, 2026, the Respondent requested an extension under paragraph 5(e) of the Rules. On January 19, 2026, the Center invited the Complainant to comment on the Respondent’s request by January 22, 2026. The Complainant did not comment on the Respondent’s request. On January 26, 2026, the

Center provided the Respondent an extension until February 4, 2026, under paragraph 5(e) of the Rules. The Response was filed with the Center on February 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on February 9, 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.

On February 17, 2026, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1, which was amended on March 3, 2026. The subject-matter of the Procedural Order is discussed below. The Procedural Order (as amended) invited the Respondent to provide a further submission by February 24, 2026, and the Complainant to reply to any such further submission by March 3, 2026. The Respondent did not respond to the Procedural Order by the date specified, and the date for the Complainant's reply is therefore moot.

4. Late Filing of Response

The Response was filed one day after the expiration of the various extensions granted to the Respondent. However, the Panel does not consider that the Complainant is unfairly prejudiced by that late Response and, having regard to the desirability of each party having a reasonable opportunity to present its case, the Panel determines, in its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, to admit the late Response.

5. Factual Background

The Complainant was established in 2014. It is a United States-based company with additional offices in the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic. It provides a software platform under the name and mark OUTREACH for sales management and marketing engagement, its product enabling users to customize, prioritize and analyze marketing, including email marketing and sales activities.

The Complainant is the owner of various registrations for the trademark OUTREACH. Those registrations include, for example:

- United States trademark registration number 5313808 for the word mark OUTREACH, registered in the United States Supplemental Register on October 17, 2017;
- United States trademark registration number 6142045 for the word mark OUTREACH, registered in the United States Principal Register on September 1, 2020; and
- European Union Trade Mark registration number 014740732 for the word mark OUTREACH, registered on March 1, 2016.

The Complainant operates a website at "www.outreach.io".

The disputed domain name was created on October 18, 2021. The Respondent submits that it acquired it, together with other assets of a company named Automaly Ltd, in June 2024.

The Complainant exhibits evidence that, as of December 22, 2025, the disputed domain name redirected to <outreachly.ai> and resolved to a website headed "outreachly", with the strapline: "#1 LinkedIn AI & Email Automation Program". The website offered the ability to: "Automate your LinkedIn and outreach in one place with smart AI content generation, AI inbox management, and buyer intent data".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that its OUTREACH trademark enjoys wide international recognition, by virtue of its continuous operations since 2014 and high level of customer and public engagement. It claims to have serviced over 200,000 "contracted seats" since 2022, and to work with high-profile individuals in a number of well-known companies. It cites total investment of USD 239 million since launch, and states that its website is visited by an average of 11,680 daily users, with total unique visitors in excess of 7.5 million between 2021 and 2025. The Complainant also exhibits media commentary upon its business activities, and refers to various industry awards and accolades.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its OUTREACH trademark. It states that the disputed domain name incorporates that trademark in full, with the addition only of the generic suffix "ly", which does not serve to distinguish the disputed domain name from the trademark. The Complainant contends that the Top Level Domain ("TLD") ".io" is to be disregarded for the purpose of comparison, while noting that the Respondent has adopted the same TLD as that used for the Complainant's own website.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its OUTREACH trademark, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by that name, and that the Respondent is making neither bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has opportunistically registered the disputed domain name to take advantage of its established OUTREACH mark and to cause customer confusion, which activities cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent's part.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and that such bad faith is clear from the following matters in particular:

- the adoption of the Complainant's OUTREACH trademark in its entirety, for the purpose of offering competitive goods and services;
- its use of identical terminology on its software platform, including the terms "Engage Pro" and "Engage AI", which reflect another of the Complainant's registered trademarks, namely OUTREACH ENGAGE (among others, United States trademark registration number 7422557 registered in the United States Principal Register on June 18, 2024);
- its choice of a TLD which mirrors the Complainant's principal website at "www.outreach.io"; and
- its registration of multiple other confusing domain names, namely <outreachly.ai>, <outreachly.net>, <outreachly.online>, <outreachly.digital>, <outreachly.app> and <outreachly.tech>, in a concerted attempt to target the Complainant's customers.¹

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name was first registered several years after the Complainant commenced using its OUTREACH trademark, and that it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of its long-established trademark rights when it registered the disputed domain name. It contends that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of the success of the Complainant's trademark, and in particular to attempt to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with that trademark. The Complainant also claims instances of actual customer confusion, although without supporting evidence.

¹The domain names cited by the Complainant have been the subject of separate proceedings before the Alternative Dispute Resolution Forum under title *Outreach Corporation v. Collette Rutherford / Outreachly / Reachsoft OU / Reachsoft OÜ*, Case No. FA2512002194135, such proceedings having been determined on February 13, 2026. That determination included the transfer of the domain name <outreachly.ai>, to which the disputed domain name has redirected, to the Complainant.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant's OUTREACH trademark is descriptive, generic, and weak. It argues that the Complainant's original registration in the United States Supplemental Register constitutes an admission that the mark is merely descriptive, and that while the Complainant eventually obtained Principal Register status after five years of use, this does not eliminate the descriptive nature of the term.

The Respondent contends that "outreach" is a common English word widely used in the marketing industry, and is descriptive of the act of "reaching out" to prospects. It submits that the field is crowded with third-party commercial uses of OUTREACH trademarks, and exhibits a list of United States trademarks comprising or including the mark OUTREACH, which it says are used by unrelated businesses in the advertising and marketing sector.

The Respondent contends that it has rights and legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, by virtue of it having been used since January 2022 in connection with LinkedIn automation services. It states that the disputed domain name was selected by its predecessor in interest, Automaly Ltd, following a convention in the SaaS (software as a service) field of adding an "ly" suffix to a descriptive term. It states that the "outreachly" brand was chosen for consistency with an existing "automaly" brand, and that "[a]t no point during the naming or registration process was the Complainant's mark considered".

The Respondent states that its principal, Collette Rutherford, was working in a physical retail environment in the United Kingdom until 2015, dealing with in-store aesthetics and window displays, and had no knowledge of the Complainant or its OUTREACH trademark. The Respondent states that it acquired the business of Automaly Ltd, including the disputed domain name, in June 2024 and upgraded the platform in 2025 from standard deterministic automation to probabilistic (agentic) AI, using large language models to generate personalized responses.

The Respondent argues that the legitimacy of its business is evidenced by a public-facing professional website, documented brand evolution, and dominant organic Google rankings for competitive terms relating to LinkedIn automation.

The Respondent further contends that the Parties operate in fundamentally different commercial markets. The Complainant provides a managerial oversight platform that creates reminders for employees to manually perform tasks, targeting large enterprise customers with contracts often exceeding USD 45,000 annually. The Respondent, by contrast, provides an autonomous platform that executes LinkedIn workflows automatically, targeting small agencies and solopreneurs with pay-as-you-go pricing averaging USD 125 per month. The Respondent argues that this distinction means that customers would not confuse the two services.

The Respondent argues that the Complainant has presented a fundamentally misleading case, by claiming to "backdate" current business activities that did not exist at the date either its original trademarks or the disputed domain name were registered. The Respondent states that, on October 2021, the Complainant's brand identity was tethered to manual sales sequencing and CRM task management, and not the agentic technologies to which the Complainant pivoted in 2024 and now markets. The Respondent contends that it could not have targeted a brand identity that did not exist at the time of registration, and that even if it had been aware of the Complainant's mark, which it was not, there was no commercial motive to target a manual process when building an automated platform.

The Respondent requests the dismissal of the Complainant and a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking against the Complainant. It claims that the Complainant has acted in bad faith by misrepresenting its business activities at the date the disputed domain name was registered, and by failing to conduct any due diligence that would have demonstrated the legitimate nature of the Respondent's business.

6. Procedural Order No. 1

By way of Procedural Order No.1 (referenced above) the Panel noted that, as stated in section 3.9 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)):²

“[...] the transfer of a domain name registration from a third party to the respondent is not a renewal and the date on which the current registrant acquired the domain name is the date a panel will consider in assessing bad faith.”

In view of the Respondent’s evidence that it did not acquire the disputed domain name until June 2024, it was invited therefore to clarify whether (and if so on what basis) it claimed any ownership interest in the disputed domain name prior to that date. The Respondent was also invited, to the extent of its own knowledge or information, to comment on the circumstances surrounding the creation of the “automaly” and later “outreachly” textual and figurative branding in 2020 and 2021.

As stated above, the Respondent did not respond to Procedural Order No. 1.

7. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are 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 or is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark OUTREACH. The disputed domain name comprises that mark in full, together with the suffix “ly”, which does not prevent the Complainant’s trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the first element under the Policy is established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests, and C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds it appropriate in this case to consider the second and third elements under the Policy together, since similar factors will inform its findings in respect of each of those elements.

The Panel accepts the Respondent’s contentions that the Complainant’s OUTREACH trademark is relatively weak in nature, comprising a dictionary term that is also in commercial use by other parties operating in the digital marketing field. However, that finding is not determinative of the central question in this case, namely, whether the Respondent registered or has used the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark rights.

Although the Complainant’s trademark may lack inherent distinctiveness, the Complainant has nevertheless established that it has used it, since at least 2015, in connection with sales management and marketing engagement services, and has developed a significant level of customer and public awareness of the OUTREACH trademark in that sector.

² On February 18, 2026, the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) was superseded by WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)). The provision of section 3.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) remained unamended in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Panel also considers it significant that the Complainant's operates its principal website from "www.outreach.io", the same TLD having been adopted by the Respondent in connection with the disputed domain name.

The Respondent places significant emphasis on its submissions that it was not, and had no reason to be, aware of the Complainant's OUTREACH trademark in 2015, that the disputed domain name was originally registered in 2021 without reference to the Complainant's trademark, and that the Complainant did not pivot to AI-based services until 2024. However, those submissions appear to the Panel to be flawed. In particular:

- It is unclear why the Respondent's state of knowledge in 2015 (based on its principal's employment in a United Kingdom physical retail environment) is thought to be of significance. The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in June 2024, for use in connection with automated digital marketing services, and it is at that date that its state of knowledge is relevant. Given the profile of the Complainant at that time, the Panel does not accept that the Respondent was unaware, or ought not to have been aware, of the Complainant's OUTREACH trademark, or its website at "www.outreach.io", at the date it acquired the disputed domain name.

- The Respondent appears throughout the Response to treat itself and the prior owner of the disputed domain name, Automaly Ltd, as effectively the same party, and has declined the opportunity provided by Procedural Order No. 1 to clarify its position in this regard. The Panel finds, in the circumstances, that the Respondent is unable to give credible evidence as to what its predecessor may have known or intended at the date the disputed domain name was originally created, namely October 2021.

- According to the Respondent's own submissions, the Complainant pivoted to providing large-language AI-driven systems in 2024, the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in June 2024, and the Respondent "upgraded" the existing Automaly platform to provide similar services to the Complainant's in 2025. The Panel finds these matters to be indicative of an intention to benefit unfairly from the Complainant's established rights.

The Panel does not discount the fact that the Complainant's trademark is descriptive in nature, that it could credibly refer to the act of "reaching out", and that other parties make commercial use of the same or a similar mark. The Panel also acknowledges that the "ly" suffix was not uncommon among start-ups at the date the disputed domain name was originally registered, or indeed that the ".io" TLD is used by numerous SaaS businesses. However, while these factors may have assisted the original registrant of the disputed domain name in 2021, the Panel finds the position to have become materially different by the date the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name, considering in particular the Complainant's greater profile at that time and its pivot to AI-driven services.

Based on an overall assessment of the circumstances, therefore, the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name opportunistically in 2024, to take unfair advantage of its close similarity with the Complainant's website at "www.outreach.io" and of the established goodwill attaching to its OUTREACH trademark. The Respondent cannot demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in circumstances where it acquired the disputed domain name in order to take advantage of the Complainant's rights in this manner.

The Panel finds moreover that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The failure of the Respondent to reply to Procedural Order No. 1 also adds to the impression of a lack of legitimacy and bad faith on the Respondent's part.

The Panel therefore finds that both the second and third elements under the Policy are established.

C. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

In view of the Panel's finding under section 7C above, the Panel finds that the Complaint was not brought in bad faith and therefore there is no basis for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

8. 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 <outreachly.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: March 6, 2026