

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TruHlth Holdings Inc. v. Terence Njiah
Case No. D2026-2454

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TruHlth Holdings Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Emerson, Thomson & Bennett, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Terence Njiah, Cameroon.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <biolongevitylabss.org> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 4, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 8, 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 verified that 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 June 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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

The Complainant is based in the United States and is engaged in the manufacture of peptides and bioregulators. The Complainant's official website is available at "www.biolongevitylabs.com", which was registered on June 13, 2024. When conducting an Internet search of the term "biolongevity labs", the first page results appear to primarily reference the Complainant.¹

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00004304135 for the word mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS, filed on December 2, 2025, claiming the United States priority of August 19, 2025, and registered February 27, 2026, in classes 1 and 5; and
- European Union trademark registration No. 019286841 for the word mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS, filed on December 4, 2025, claiming the United States priority of August 19, 2025, and registered April 26, 2026, in classes 1 and 5.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 11, 2026, and presently does not resolve to an active webpage.

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, in its very brief Complaint, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark and domain name and is likely to divert traffic from the Complainant's legitimate website, diminishing the strength of the Complainant's trademark and weakening the distinctiveness of the Complainant's brand.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name given that the Respondent has no legitimate need for the disputed domain name containing the Complainant's BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark since the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no noncommercial, fair use, or other legitimate rights to it.

As to the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark after the Complainant had already established rights and registered the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com>; therefore, the disputed domain name registration was made primarily to disrupt the Complainant's business and the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website, in direct violation of UDRP Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

B. Respondent

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

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7, notwithstanding the addition of another "s". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

In that sense, and according to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent, known as "Terence Njiah", who has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and the Respondent is neither authorized, licensed, nor been allowed to use the Complainant's trademark, whether in the disputed domain name, or in any other way. In addition, the case record does not show that the Respondent has any registered trademarks corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name consisting of a misleading

typographical error and its similarity to the Complainant's official domain name <biolongevitylabs.com>, on balance, indicates the Respondent's ultimate intent to confuse Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

The Panel 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name (which appears to be a typosquat variant of the Complainant's trademark), the Respondent's lack of participation in the proceedings (despite seemingly receiving notice of the proceedings), and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel 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 <biolongevitylabss.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: July 31, 2026