

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Project A Services GmbH & Co. KG v. Aili Liu, A11 LLC  
Case No. DSO2026-0001

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Project A Services GmbH & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Thomas Rechtsanwälte, Germany.

The Respondent is Aili Liu, A11 LLC, United States of America (“United States”).

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <a11.so> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 19, 2026. On January 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 20, 2026, 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 January 22, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 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

According to the Complainant's website, the Complainant is a German limited partnership (KG) registered in the District Court of Charlottenburg (Berlin) under number HRA 51487 B. The Complainant has provided only limited information about itself in the Complaint other than specifying its two registered trademarks and the fact that its website is found at "www.a11.global" (the Panel notes in passing that the domain name associated with this website was registered on June 13, 2025, after the registration date of the disputed domain name). The said website describes the Complainant as having a team of seven people, noting that it specializes in converting startup companies into "unicorns".<sup>1</sup>

The Complainant is the owner of two registered trademarks for the mark A11, namely:

European Union Registered Trademark Number 19173068 for the word mark A11, filed on April 15, 2025, published on April 30, 2025, and registered on August 8, 2025, in Class 35 (broadly speaking, assistance with business planning); and

International Registered Trademark Number 1890022 for the word mark A11, based upon the above European Union registered trademark, registered on October 24, 2025 in Class 35, with designations in respect of Switzerland, United Kingdom, Qatar, and United States, noting that at present as far as the United States is concerned, the status of this mark is that it has not yet been accepted by the Office and has not yet been assigned to an examiner.

Both of these trademarks were registered after the date of registration of the disputed domain name, although the Complainant points out that it had filed the application for its said European Union mark about a month before the disputed domain name was registered.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 28, 2025. The website associated with the disputed domain name is titled "A11 LLC", i.e., the Respondent's organization name.<sup>2</sup> According to a screenshot provided by the Complainant dated January 2, 2026, the website associated with the disputed domain name was a static page featuring the title "A11", underneath which was the statement "We help early-stage startups find PMF through bold GTM strategy, viral distribution, and growth execution. From zero to millions of users, we help founders turn ambition into traction. Contact us: [Respondent's email address]".

By February 25, 2026, when the Panel visited the said website, it still bore the title "A11 LLC" and contained the message noted in the Complainant's screenshot. However, it had been slightly re-worded as follows: "We help early-stage hardware startups with end-to-end manufacturing—from prototype to production and distribution. From zero to millions of users, we help founders turn ambitious ideas into physical products with real traction. Please find more information about our services on our Future Factory website: [link] thefuturefactory.ai". The website to which the said site is linked, "www.thefuturefactory.ai" consists of a

---

<sup>1</sup> The Panel visited the Complainant's said website on February 25, 2026, on the basis that the Complaint effectively contained an invitation to do so ("see a11.global"). This might be viewed as the Panel conducting its own research (on which topic, see section 4.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)")) although the Panel treats the said content of said website as effectively incorporated in the Complaint due to said invitation.

<sup>2</sup> The Panel visited the Respondent's said website on February 25, 2026, on the basis that its content was mentioned in the Complaint, a screenshot was provided by the Complainant dated January 2, 2026, and a specific assertion was made by the Complainant that the Respondent had added no further content since the date of the screenshot. The Panel therefore considered it appropriate to view the said website to determine whether the content had changed given that 54 days had elapsed since the Complainant's visit and that there were 17 days between the date of screenshot and the filing of the Complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

highly stylized website designed in “computer code” style which is titled “5 days in Asia to get your hardware built. Walk factory floors, meet suppliers, and leave with real quotes – for hardware founders ready to scale in robotics, consumer electronics, physical AI, biotech and beyond. Const nextCohort = ‘March 15 – 20, 2026’; > apply\_now()”. The respective domain name, <thefuturefactory.ai> was registered on July 4, 2025.

The Panel noted that the Respondent appeared to be a representative (“the Respondent individual”) of a limited company named A11 LLC and the company itself (“the Respondent company”). Accordingly, the Panel considered it appropriate to consult the corporate register for the State where the Respondent company is based, namely California, United States.<sup>3</sup> This search confirmed that the Respondent company, of which the Respondent individual is a Manager, or Member, is entity number B20250133491, formed in California, United States, on May 26, 2025.

The contact email address disclosed by the Registrar also took the Panel to the Respondent individual’s personal website (the published contact details of which share said email address) in which the Respondent individual’s profile states that, in 2025, it scaled a business named <fish.audio> “to 5m ARR in 2 months as head of ops”, describes the Respondent being a “frequent flyer between sf and Shenzhen [...]”, and adds that it is currently “running thefuturefactory.ai - bringing hardware founders from sf to factories in shenzhen, helping them move from prototype to production” and exploring, inter alia, “US-China tech competition”.<sup>4</sup>

## 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 its trademarks are used for all services for which they are registered, referencing its website at “www.a11.global”. The Complainant adds that it is an early-stage investor and helps startups grow to unicorns, noting that according to the Respondent’s website under the disputed domain name, the Respondent also targets early-stage startups to help them grow. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademarks both consist only of “A11” and are thus identical.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because it has made no use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name, or a corresponding name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, adding that the Respondent’s website only contains a contact email address and a promise concerning early-stage startups and founders. The Complainant states that emails sent to the contact address provided are not answered and concludes that the disputed domain name is being used to divert attention away from the Complainant’s website and to persuade the Complainant to purchase the disputed domain name from the Respondent. The Complainant also submits that there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, asserting that the related website is operated with intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers into believing that it belongs to the Complainant, and stating that the

---

<sup>3</sup> The search described was a basic business search in the California Secretary of State’s Business Search website for “A11 LLC”, selecting the “History” option, and downloading the “Statement of Information” on which the Respondent individual is named. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8. The Panel considered putting its finding to the Complainant for comments but determined that this was unnecessary as the Complainant already had the necessary information to have been able to perform its own basic business search for the Respondent company.

<sup>4</sup>To find the Respondent individual’s personal website, the Panel performed a Google search on the Respondent’s email address as noted in the verified registrant data from the Registrar. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8. The Panel considered putting its finding to the Complainant for comments but determined that this was unnecessary as the Complainant already had the Respondent’s email address from the verified Registrar data and therefore had the necessary information to have been able to perform this search (or any other research into the Respondent), before it filed the amended Complaint, in accordance with good practice in cases under the Policy.

Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has it been otherwise authorized by the Complainant to make any use of its trademarks, or any variation thereof, in a domain name or otherwise.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, noting its registration date of May 28, 2025, which it adds is one month after the publication of the Complainant's trademark application by the European Union Intellectual Property Office, made on April 30, 2025. The Complainant submits that since that date, the Respondent has not added any further content to its website, concluding that the Respondent is not pursuing any legitimate objectives with the use of the disputed domain name, but is only using it to damage the Complainant's business and to induce the Complainant or a competitor to purchase it. The Complainant adds that the Respondent is preventing the Complainant from using the disputed domain name for its own business purposes.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The applicable Top Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name (here, ".so") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are conjunctive. A consequence of this is that failure on the part of a complainant to demonstrate one element of the Policy will result in failure of the complaint in its entirety. Accordingly, in light of the Panel's findings in connection with the third element assessment under the Policy, no good purpose would be served by addressing the issue of the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

### **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 appears to be engaged in a commercial endeavor which assists businesses to identify suitable manufacturing facilities in China "from prototype to production and distribution". This appears to the Panel, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to be a genuine going concern rather than a pretext for cybersquatting. Nevertheless, the Complainant's central contention is

that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because the registration took place one month after publication of the Complainant's A11 trademark application, noting also that the nature of the Respondent's business (in broad terms – helping other businesses to scale and grow) matches that of the Complainant and the services in respect of which the trademark application was filed.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 28, 2025, before the Complainant's trademark was registered on August 8, 2025. Where a respondent registers a domain name before the complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels will not normally find bad faith on the part of the respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1. There is an exception to this general approach, however, in the case of scenarios described in the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2, which notes that "[...] in certain limited circumstances where the facts of the case establish that the respondent's intent in registering the domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant's nascent (typically as yet unregistered) trademark rights, panels have been prepared to find that the respondent has acted in bad faith. Such scenarios include registration of a domain name [...] following the complainant's filing of a trademark application".

The Panel must therefore consider whether this limited exception applies in the present case, given that it is evident that the disputed domain name was registered about one month after the Complainant's filing of its application for its European Union trademark. It has been noted that, "The scenarios envisaged by section 3.8.2 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) all refer to a respondent who, due to specific and special knowledge, intends to unfairly capitalize on a particular complainant's nascent trademark rights that are about to come into existence" (*Salomon Brothers Group Inc. v. Domain Administration, CitiBank, N.A.*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3406](#)).<sup>5</sup> The Panel has therefore applied its mind to the question of whether the Respondent is more likely to have had such specific and special knowledge here and whether it is more probable than not that the Respondent had formed an intent to target the Complainant's then nascent mark in bad faith. The Panel notes that the other possibility raised by the factual matrix here is that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name independently of any knowledge of the Complainant's nascent rights with a view to establishing its own business.

On one side of the balance is the fact that, had the Respondent (hypothetically) conducted a search in the European Union Intellectual Property Office before it registered the disputed domain name, it might have identified the application for the Complainant's mark, in respect of services similar to those that the Respondent appears itself to have been planning to deliver. However, the Panel considers that this is, on its own, a very weak indicium of cybersquatting in the present case, bearing in mind that on the other side of the balance is the fact that the Respondent appears to have (1) incorporated a California, United States, company of a corresponding name as its first act, (2) registered the disputed domain name two days later, (3) published a website relating to its stated business purpose, perhaps initially somewhat in "stealth mode", (4) subsequently took steps in furtherance of such purpose, namely to register an additional domain name to which the website associated with the disputed domain name has been subsequently linked, and (5) built a substantial website of a distinctive design under the adopted, linked, brand. This appears to the Panel to be entirely consistent with the development and organic brand evolution of the Respondent's hardware-manufacturing consultancy business.

In terms of geographic location, the Respondent's business activities appear to be focused on China and the United States. There is no evidence that, in developing its business identity, incorporating the same, and registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent would or should have been looking in the direction of European trademark applications at all whereby the requisite special knowledge might be imputed to it. Even if it had such knowledge, there is no evidence that it intended to target the Complainant's nascent rights in particular. For example, there is no evidence that the Respondent has adopted the look and feel of the Complainant's website, nor any other indication that the Respondent may have been setting out to impersonate the Complainant or otherwise take unfair advantage of the Complainant's rights once they came into existence. The Respondent does not appear to have offered the disputed domain name for sale in the approximately nine months since the disputed domain name was registered, either to the Complainant, to a competitor of the Complainant, or more generally. Instead, the steps taken by the Respondent appear to be

---

<sup>5</sup> The Panel notes in passing that the relevant wording has not changed materially in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

typical of those that a legitimate business owner would take, and not those of a cybersquatter.

The Complainant pointed the Panel to the Complainant's own corporate website for confirmation that the Complainant is using its A11 mark for all services for which it has been registered. On that topic, it must be noted that the Complainant's own domain name as used for that website was not itself registered until June 13, 2025, namely, in the month following the Respondent company's incorporation and the registration of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence before the Panel that the Complainant's corporate website (or indeed any other online material) would have been visible to the Respondent in connection with the Complainant's A11 (then nascent) trademark, or its proposals to use it, with the exception of the published trademark application itself. Notably, the Complainant has not provided any evidence of prior use of the mark, for example, as an unregistered trademark, that might have come to the notice of the Respondent.

The Panel cannot overlook the fact that the Complainant's mark is an inherently simple alphanumeric string of three characters in length, with a single letter (the first in the alphabet) and two digits consisting of the same number (the lowest whole or non-zero number, or the number eleven). Such a combination is relatively commonplace and likely to be of broad appeal, whereby it might be selected by a wide range of businesses independently of one another. The Panel concludes on the evidence before it that, although the Parties operate in broadly similar fields, it is more probable that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name stems from a coincidental choice of the same three-character combination adopted by the Complainant, rather than from any deliberate or intentional targeting of the Complainant's nascent rights.

The Respondent has not come forward to defend its registration and use of the disputed domain name, and, at least according to the Complainant's unproved assertions, has not answered the Complainant's email to its contact address. Nevertheless, it remains the Complainant's primary obligation to prove that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith on the balance of probabilities, and on the record before the Panel, it has failed to do so.

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting of the Complainant or its trademark rights because the Complainant had no trademark rights at the time that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Andrew D. S. Lothian/*

**Andrew D. S. Lothian**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 10, 2026