

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LifeArc v. Jessly Rodriguez
Case No. D2025-1396

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LifeArc, United Kingdom, represented by Perkins Coie, LLP, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Jessly Rodriguez, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lifearcresearch.health> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 4, 2025. On April 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 7, 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 April 8, 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 April 8, 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 April 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 5, 2025. On May 5, 2025, the Respondent requested an extension of the due date to file a Response. On the same day, the Center granted the Respondent the automatic four calendar day extension under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, and the due date for filing of the Response was extended to May 9, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on May 5, 2025. On May 19, 2025, the

Center sent a communication to the Parties regarding a potential settlement of the dispute, and informed the Complainant that it may request suspension by May 26, 2025. The Complainant did not respond to this communication.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on June 2, 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.

On June 11, 2025, the Complainant requested a 30-day suspension of the proceeding for the purpose of settlement negotiations. On June 12, 2025, the Panel suspended the proceeding until July 12, 2025. Neither of the Parties provided any information about their settlement discussions within the suspension period. On July 15, 2025, as instructed by the Panel, the Center informed the Parties that the Panel will proceed to issue a decision, unless the Panel hears otherwise from the Parties by July 17, 2025. Neither of the Parties responded to this communication. Accordingly, the Panel proceeded to issue the present decision.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a non-profit corporation based in the United Kingdom. It provides medical and scientific research, clinical and consultation services relating to health to hospitals, medical research organizations, pharmaceutical companies, and academic institutions based in the United States, the United Kingdom, and a number of other jurisdictions.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for the sign “LIFEARC” (the “LIFEARC trademark”), including the following registrations:

- the International trademark LIFEARC with registration No. 1380043, registered on April 27, 2017 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, and 45, for several jurisdictions, including the United States;
- the United Kingdom trademark LIFEARC with registration No. UK00003193929, registered on October 13, 2017 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, and 45; and
- the United States trademark LIFEARC with registration No. 5624714, registered on December 11, 2018 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, and 45.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <lifearc.org>.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 12, 2023. It currently resolves to a landing page of wix.com. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, in 2023 the disputed domain name resolved to a Spanish-language website with the logo “Life Arc Research Centers”, the title “Ayudamos Hoy a Mejorar las Medicinas del Futuro Al Servicio de la Humanidad” (in English, “We Help Today to Improve the Medicines of the Future in the Service of Humanity”), and with the copyright notice “© 2023 by Dayana Simancas”, and in 2023, it resolved to an English-language website with the same logo “Life Arc Research Centers”, the title “Pioneering Clinical Research for a Healthier Future”, and the copyright notice “Copyright © 2024 Innovatech Business”. In both of these versions, the website at the disputed domain name invited visitors to apply for inclusion in various clinical trials and research studies by providing their names, contact details, age and health conditions.

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.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LIFEARC trademark, because it wholly incorporates the trademark, and the addition of the word “research”, which is descriptive of the Complainant’s health services, increases the likelihood of confusion.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it registered it without the Complainant’s consent. The Complainant notes that the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name, is not associated to the Complainant and does not hold any relevant trademarks. The Complainant states that the Respondent is not engaged in a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, because it uses the Complainant’s distinctive LIFEARC trademark for identical or competitive clinical research services, which is likely to cause confusion or falsely suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It states that the Respondent attempts to disrupt the Complainant’s business and to divert Internet users to the website at the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s LIFEARC trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name and of the Respondent’s services offered on it that are competitive to the Complainant’s services.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its rights prior to registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that its LIFEARC trademark is distinctive and well-known throughout the world, including in the United States, in connection with the Complainant’s health services. The Complainant notes in this regard that all top results of a Google search for “lifearc” refer to the Complainant or its related company, LifeArc Ventures, and all top results of a Google search for “life arc research” also refer to the Complainant, except one reference to the Respondent at the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is offering clinical research and trial health-related services at the disputed domain name, so it must be knowledgeable of the health field and must have had knowledge of the Complainant’s LIFEARC trademark used for the Complainant’s health services.

B. Respondent

The Respondent denies any bad faith in the registration or use of the disputed domain name and asserts that it was registered in good faith and without intent to infringe on the Complainant’s rights.

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name includes the word “research,” referring to the clinical research services carried out by the Respondent, and maintains that the addition of this term sufficiently differentiates the disputed domain name from any existing entity, especially since the Complainant is not operating under the same business scope or within the same geographical market.

The Respondent submits that its business name is Life Arc Research Centers Corp, which was chosen in good faith based on descriptive language reflecting its clinical trial site operations. The Respondent states that it did not intend to copy or benefit from the Complainant’s trademark, and at the time of registration was unaware of any potential conflict.

The Respondent states that it operates a legitimate business providing clinical research services to the pharmaceutical and biotechnology industry. The Respondent maintains that it is not a competitor of the Complainant and does not engage in the same business. The Respondent submits that it does not run its own studies, develop therapeutics, or analyze statistical results. Instead, it operates as a service provider engaged by pharmaceutical sponsors to carry out protocol-specific clinical procedures at research sites.

The Respondent notes that at the time of the disputed domain name registration, it was unaware of the Complainant’s trademark rights. It maintains that, believing the Complainant to be an internationally based organization with no conflicting commercial presence in the United States, the Respondent selected the disputed domain name and business name in good faith for internal branding purposes within a different business sector.

The Respondent denies that the disputed domain name was registered or used in bad faith. According to it, there was no intention to profit from, disrupt, or confuse users regarding the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent states that the disputed domain name was registered solely for use in connection with the Respondent's own independent clinical trial site operations.

The Respondent notes that any resemblance to the Complainant's trademark was unintentional and resulted from a misunderstanding of trademark conflicts, particularly regarding international and United States specific protections. The Respondent notes that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark filings or existing rights and was not intended to target the Complainant in any way, while the use of a privacy protection service was standard for domain registration and not intended to obscure ownership.

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 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 the LIFEARC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the LIFEARC trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LIFEARC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "research") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the LIFEARC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [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 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.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive LIFEARC trademark with the added word "research", which is descriptive of the Complainant's medical and scientific research activities, which according to the evidence submitted with the Complainant have been carried out including in the United States for several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been used for a website dedicated to clinical research activities related to different human health conditions, which website offered visitors to apply for participation in clinical trials and medical research against compensation. Such activities are identical, similar or complementary to the activities of the Complainant. The Respondent claims that it operates an entity under the name Life Arc Research Centers Corp, but has provided no evidence for the existence of such entity, and the copyright notices included on the website at the disputed domain name referred to entities with names different and unrelated to the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent's website has included any disclaimer for the absence of relationship between the Parties.

The Respondent denies having had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark, but at the same time makes the following statements:

"Respondent believed the addition of this descriptive term ["research"] sufficiently differentiated the domain from any existing entity, especially since Complainant is not operating under the same business scope or within the same geographical market."

"Believing LifeArc to be an internationally based organization with no conflicting commercial presence in the U.S., Respondent selected the domain name and business name in good faith for internal branding purposes within a different business sector."

The Panel understands these statements as an admission by the Respondent that it was aware of the Complainant and its activities and has considered this when deciding to register the disputed domain name and to use it for a website offering services that are identical, similar, or possibly complementary to the services offered by the Complainant.

In view of the above, and in the absence of any contrary evidence, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name not in the pursuit of some commercial project independent of the Complainant, but targeting the Complainant and its trademark and reputation in an attempt to exploit those to attract visitors to the website at the disputed domain name and to offer them its services in competition with the Complainant. Such infringing conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore 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.

As discussed above in this decision, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the distinctive LIFEARC trademark of the Complainant and has been used for a website that offered services that are identical, similar or complementary to the services of the Complainant. The Respondent does not provide any plausible explanation why it chose to register a domain name that incorporates the Complainant's trademark in combination with a word that describes the Complainant's activities and to use it for a website that offered services that overlap with those of the Complainant, and its statements appear to confirm that the Respondent knew and took account of the Complainant's activities when it registered the disputed domain name.

All this considered, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that by registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LIFEARC trademark as to the source or affiliation of the Respondent's website and of the services offered on it. Arguably this would be trademark infringement under national law, but at minimum, this certainly supports a finding of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <lifearcresearch.health> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: July 18, 2025