

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Regen Lab USA, LLC, Regen Lab, SA v. Mark Ghalili
Case No. D2025-3474

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Regen Lab USA, LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”) and Regen Lab, SA, Switzerland, represented by Topshelf Trademarks LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Mark Ghalili, United States, represented by Goldstein Patent Law, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <regenlabs.com> 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 August 27, 2025. On August 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 28, 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 (Domains By Proxy, LLC/ Regen Labs, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 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 September 1, 2025.

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 September 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 25, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on September 24, 2025. The Complainant submitted supplemental filing on September 30, 2025.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton, Sally M. Abel, and Paul M. DeCicco as panelists in this matter on October 30, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 Complainants are part of an international group engaged in regenerative medicine, dermatology, and medical-device technologies. Their materials describe them as specialists in platelet-rich plasma (“PRP”) and other cell-therapy systems used in orthopedics, wound care, and dermatology. The Complainants have used the REGENLAB brand since the early 2000s in connection with PRP preparation devices, aesthetic and dermatological procedures, biological preparations, wound-care and orthopedic regenerative treatments, and related training and clinical programs. They have operated the domain <regenlab.com> since 2004 and also control country-level domains such as <regenlab.co.uk> and <regenlabusa.com>, both registered in 2013.

The Complainants own numerous REGENLAB and REGEN-formative trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions. These include International Registration No. 1040584 for REGENLAB, registered on March 31, 2010 (Classes 3, 5, and 10); various U.S. registrations covering biological preparations, PRP-related medical devices, and consulting and educational services in regenerative medicine; and non-U.S. registrations such as European Union Registration No. 018704612 for REGENSKIN, registered on October 7, 2022, covering non-medicated skincare products. One of the Complainants’ U.S. registrations, No. 3,922,275 for REGENLAB, registered on February 22, 2011, originally covered goods in Classes 3, 5, and 10; the Class 3 cosmetics portion was deleted in 2016 following a partial cancellation for non-use, while the Class 5 and Class 10 portions remain active. The Complainants also hold U.S. Registration No. 7,777,504 “504 Registration” for cosmetics in Class 3 and cosmetic distribution services in Class 35. In September 2025, the Respondent petitioned the United States Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (“TTAB”) to cancel the Complainants’ “504 Registration”; that proceeding remains pending.

The Complainants Annexes 19a–19h document a long-standing use of the REGENLAB brand in connection with aesthetic dermatology, including anti-aging treatments, skin-rejuvenation procedures, wrinkle-reduction therapies, and PRP-based cosmetic applications.

Annexes 25–27 (Supplemental Filing of the Complaint) show that, before acquiring the disputed domain name, the Respondent promoted stem-cell facials, hair-growth procedures using regenerative biologics, PRP-adjacent aesthetic techniques, and other skincare-related services.

The disputed domain name <regenlabs.com> was originally registered in 2013 by an unrelated third party. The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name on September 25, 2020, for USD 3,320. Following the acquisition, the disputed domain resolved to a website advertising cosmetic creams, peptide-based anti-aging products, wrinkle-reduction serums, regenerative skincare formulations, and other aesthetic-related products. Archive captures in the record show that the disputed domain name was subsequently integrated with the Respondent’s medical-practice website, including through navigation links and cross-referencing between the two sites.

In October 2020, the Respondent incorporated a business entity named “Regen Labs.” The Respondent holds U.S. Registration No. 6,494,979 for REGEN LABS in Class 5, registered on September 21, 2021, for dietary and nutritional supplements. The Respondent does not appear to hold any trademark registrations covering cosmetics, skincare, aesthetic dermatology, or PRP-based cosmetic or medical procedures.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their REGENLAB trademark, differing only by the addition of the pluralizing letter "s." They further state that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainants assert that the Respondent is not an unrelated or independent party but a physician operating in the regenerative and aesthetic medicine field—an area in which the Complainants have long-established commercial activity. According to the Complainants, the products and services promoted on the disputed domain name, including cosmetic and regenerative skincare offerings, overlap with the Complainants' field of use and target the same or similar audiences.

The Complainants submit that the Respondent adopted the disputed domain name to create an association with the Complainants and to benefit from the Complainants' reputation and goodwill. They argue that the Respondent's claimed rights in the name arise only from his acquisition of the disputed domain name, and that his U.S. trademark registration for dietary supplements post-dates the Complainants' longstanding international trademark rights. The Complainants contend that the Respondent's selection of a domain name nearly identical to the REGENLAB mark, within the same industry context, demonstrates knowledge of the Complainants' mark and intentional targeting.

Finally, the Complainants argue that the Respondent's use of the plural form "Regenlabs" was intended to trade on their established identity in regenerative dermatology and aesthetic medicine.

B. Respondent

The Respondent maintains that he has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent states that he acquired the disputed domain name in September 2020 and had no connection with the disputed domain name prior to that date. The Respondent obtained the disputed domain name for use in connection with his lawful business offering dietary and nutritional supplements under the name "Regen Labs" and that his adoption and use of the term predate any notice of the present dispute. The Respondent relies on his United States trademark registration for REGEN LABS in Class 5 (dietary supplements), which he argues reflects independent rights in the designation and supports a finding of legitimacy under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent further asserts that the terms "regen" and "labs" are descriptive in the context of regenerative health and wellness products and contends that his selection of the disputed domain name was based on the descriptive meaning of "regen" and "labs" rather than any reference to the Complainants. He denies intentionally targeting the Complainants, denies trying to trade on the Complainants' goodwill, denies knowledge of their REGENLAB mark at the time of acquisition, and contends that his business is distinct in nature and channels of trade from the Complainants. The Respondent submits that his use of the disputed domain name reflects a good-faith effort to brand and market his supplement products. He also points to his pending cancellation petition before the United States Trademark Trial and Appeal Board concerning the Complainants' U.S. Registration No. 7,777,504, as well as his own U.S. registration, as evidence of rights independent of the Complainants in his relevant market.

6. Procedural Issues

6.1 Consolidation of the Complainants

The two Complainants have filed one single Complaint together against the Respondent.

The Complainants have convinced the Panel that they are related companies that share a common grievance and legal interests in the REGENLAB trademark. They are affiliated entities operating within the Regen Lab group. Regen Lab SA holds and manages all non-U.S. trademarks and patents in the REGEN-formative family of marks, while Regen Lab USA, LLC holds the U.S. trademarks and patents and serves as the group's U.S. commercial arm.

Accordingly, the Panel determines that it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to consolidate the Complainants in this administrative proceeding. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.1.

6.2 Supplemental Filing

The Panel notes that on September 30, 2025, the Complainant filed an unsolicited Supplemental Filing. The Panel in its discretion decides that it is appropriate to admit and consider the Complainant's Supplemental Filing insofar as it provides arguments relevant for the merits of the case and addressing the statements made in the Response. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.6.

7. Discussion and Findings (Panel Majority)

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements that a complainant must satisfy to succeed. The Complainant must demonstrate that:

- (i) the 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 such domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The threshold test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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, by virtue of the Complainant's United States trademark registrations.

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the Mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's Mark in its entirety, adding only the letter "s." Such a minor variation does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out, without limitation, three circumstances in which a respondent shall be considered to have rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

- (i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, the respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

- (ii) the respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the complainant's trademark or service mark.

These examples are illustrative rather than exhaustive, but they guide the Panel's assessment of whether the Respondent has demonstrated any independent right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may entail the difficult task of "proving a negative," requiring information that is often within the respondent's knowledge or control. 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.

The Respondent has in the view of a majority of the Panel, adequately rebutted the case made against it. The Respondent owns a United States federal trademark registration for REGEN LABS in Class 5 for dietary supplements, obtained prior to the filing of the Complaint. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name in connection with the sale of supplements and related goods. This trademark registration confers sufficient indicia of rights or legitimate interests for purposes of the Policy, notwithstanding that the Parties dispute the relationship between their respective marks and the scope of their trademark rights. The Complainants' U.S. Registration No. 7,777,504 is subject to a pending TTAB cancellation proceeding initiated by the Respondent. The Complainants and Respondent are engaged in an ongoing trademark dispute, involving issues of priority, market overlap, and likelihood of confusion, which is appropriately addressed in the TTAB proceeding or through judicial processes rather than in this UDRP administrative proceeding.

Given the foregoing, a majority of the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

With respect to bad faith, based upon the above discussion and conclusion that the second element has not been established, the Panel majority Decision need not address the third element under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

8. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Sally M. Abel/

Sally M. Abel

Panelist

Date: December 1, 2025

/Paul M. DeCicco/

Paul M. DeCicco

Panelist

Date: December 1, 2025

DISSENTING OPINION

With great respect for my distinguished colleagues, I must dissent. In my view, the Complainants have satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and are entitled to the transfer of the disputed domain name.

The dissenting Panelist concurs with the majority's finding that the Complainants have rights in a mark that is confusingly similar to the disputed domain name.

Turning to the second element, the evidentiary burden under the Policy shifts once the Complainants make out a prima facie case. Although the overall burden of proof remains with the Complainants, UDRP panels recognize that establishing a respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests often requires proving a negative, something frequently within the exclusive knowledge of the respondent. Accordingly, where a complainant makes a prima facie showing of the absence of rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate such rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

That burden was not met. The Respondent provides no evidence that he was ever commonly known by "Regen Labs" or used that name in any bona fide manner prior to acquiring the disputed domain name in 2020. The Respondent's branding activity arises only after the disputed domain name's acquisition and is built around a term already closely associated with the Complainants' longstanding commercial identity. This type of derivative or post-hoc use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.1.

It is also important to clarify the limited relevance of filings before the United States TTAB. Those proceedings concern statutory questions of priority, distinctiveness, likelihood of confusion, use in commerce, and related Lanham Act standards. They are subject to different evidentiary rules, legal burdens, and procedural frameworks. Under the Policy, however, the Panel is confined to the record submitted in this case. As [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 4.7, 4.8, and 4.14 emphasize, a panel must reach its determination based solely on the pleadings, annexes, and evidence properly before it. The TTAB filings therefore fall outside the scope of this proceeding, and even if they were procedurally available, their different legal standards would not materially advance the narrow inquiry mandated under the Policy. The Panel should not rely on materials extrinsic to the UDRP record.

The record also supports an inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainants' REGENLAB brand before acquiring the disputed domain name. Annexes 25–27 to the Complainant's Supplemental show that, before the 2020 acquisition, the Respondent was actively promoting stem-cell facials, regenerative hair-growth procedures, PRP-adjacent aesthetic techniques, and other skincare services directly within the regenerative aesthetics space. Supplemental Annexes 24 and 28 further demonstrate that the Complainants' PRP technologies and aesthetic dermatology products were being marketed in the Los Angeles area—and elsewhere in the United States—during this same period.

Given the Respondent's professional specialization in regenerative aesthetics, the close alignment between his services and those long associated with the Complainants' products, and the documented promotion of the Complainants' technologies in its own geographic market, the Respondent's claimed lack of awareness is not credible. A practitioner operating in this niche field is overwhelmingly likely to have encountered the Complainants' PRP systems and branding before adopting the nearly identical name "RegenLabs." This substantially undermines any assertion of good-faith adoption under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

A further point bears emphasis. The Respondent is a Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine practicing in regenerative aesthetics. His clinical offerings include PRP facials, stem-cell facials, peptide-based skincare treatments, hair-restoration therapies, and related anti-aging procedures—the very areas in which the Complainants have operated for more than two decades. A practitioner working daily in this specialized field cannot plausibly disclaim awareness of a long-established international PRP device manufacturer such as the Complainants. The Respondent's claimed lack of knowledge is therefore not credible and further undermines any assertion of an innocent, good-faith adoption of the RegenLabs name.

Turning to the Respondent's asserted trademark registration, U.S. Registration No. 6,494,979 is limited to dietary and nutritional supplements—goods far removed from the regenerative dermatology, PRP-based aesthetics, cosmetic creams, anti-aging serums, and related rejuvenation services that appear on the disputed domain name website. In addition, the pending cancellation proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") should play no role in the Panel's analysis. That action is governed by the Lanham Act and involves a distinct evidentiary record, legal standards, procedural motions, counterclaims, and strategic considerations that fall entirely outside the scope of the UDRP. Importing fragments of a separate administrative litigation into this proceeding risks misunderstanding the context of pleadings or drawing conclusions from materials the parties were never asked to address here. As reflected in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 4.7, 4.8, and 4.14, a UDRP panel must decide the case solely on the record submitted in this proceeding. The USPTO cancellation action therefore provides no reliable basis for determining rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, and I do not rely on it. A respondent's trademark registration that covers entirely different goods or services does not, without more, create rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.12. The USPTO's issuance of the registration reflects the procedural boundaries of U.S. examination—focused largely on the U.S. register and class-based analysis—not a substantive determination that the Respondent has rights in the regenerative-aesthetic field.

The Respondent's actual use of the disputed domain name confirms the absence of any legitimate interest. The disputed domain name was used to market peptide-infused cosmetic creams, anti-aging products, wrinkle-reduction serums, "Reverse Aging Beauty" formulations, "Liquid Facelift®," PRP facials, stem-cell facials, and regenerative skincare techniques—commercial activities that fall squarely within the Complainants' field and that are directly aligned with the Complainants' longstanding trademark rights. The record further shows that Respondent integrated the disputed domain name into his medical practice website, added a "RegenLabs" navigation tab, and cross-promoted the RegenLabs brand in conjunction with aesthetic dermatology services.

It is also significant that the Respondent purchased the disputed domain name for USD 3,320, a premium price far exceeding typical registration costs. A party seeking a merely descriptive term could have selected any number of inexpensive alternatives. Instead, the Respondent paid thousands of dollars for a domain name that precisely mirrors the Complainants' coined and commercially established REGENLAB mark. In the context of the Respondent's ongoing expansion into regenerative and aesthetic skincare, the premium price strongly suggests intentional selection of a domain name associated with the Complainants' reputation. Numerous alternative descriptive combinations incorporating "regen" and "labs" were available at standard prices. The Respondent instead chose—and paid thousands of dollars for—the precise domain name that tracks the Complainants' globally recognized REGENLAB identity and long-standing commercial presence in regenerative dermatology. The high price, coupled with the Respondent's industry activities, strongly suggests that the domain had specific brand-related commercial value to the Respondent.

Under [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.9, an acquisition transfer of a domain name constitutes a new registration for purposes of evaluating intent. The Respondent's 2020 acquisition is therefore the critical moment for assessing good faith. The surrounding facts—including the Respondent's existing involvement in regenerative aesthetics, the premium acquisition price, the immediate deployment of the domain to promote aesthetic procedures and cosmetics, and the close resemblance to the Complainants' established brand—collectively support an inference of opportunistic registration.

This factual record establishes: (a) the Complainants' long-standing trademark rights in REGENLAB and related marks across the medical, aesthetic, dermatological, pharmaceutical, and cosmetic fields; (b) the Respondent's prior involvement in regenerative aesthetics and PRP-related procedures; (c) the Respondent's premium-price acquisition of a domain name that precisely tracks the Complainants' established commercial identity; and (d) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain to promote aesthetic and cosmetic products and services that fall directly within the scope of the Complainants' field of use.

For these reasons, I conclude that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' prima facie case and lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Further, the totality of the evidence demonstrates that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith, with the Respondent

seeking to profit commercially from the Complainants' longstanding reputation in regenerative dermatology and aesthetics by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's RegenLabs-branded products and services.

I would order that <regenlabs.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Presiding Panelist

Date: December 1, 2025