

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vatsal Patel, Danielle Bellini, I AM STILL ALIVE LLC v. Amol Gupta
Case No. D2026-2540

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Vatsal Patel (the “First Complainant”), United States of America (“United States”); Danielle Bellini (the “Second Complainant”), United States; and I AM STILL ALIVE LLC (the “Third Complainant”), United States, represented by the First Complainant.

The Respondent is Amol Gupta, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iamstillalive.org> 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 June 12, 2026. On June 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 14, 2026, 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 (Shivam Sachin Desai) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 16, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant submitted an amended Complaint on June 17, 2026 and sent multiple email communications to the Center in June 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 July 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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 August 19, 2026, the Complainant made an unsolicited supplemental submission.

4. Factual Background

The First Complainant and the Second Complainant are spouses. They conceived and develop the I AM STILL ALIVE oncology-focused platform for cancer patients, their families, and medical professionals, and established the Third Complainant in February 2024 to carry that business. The official website of their platform is located at the domain name <iamstillalive.com>.

The Third Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for I AM STILL ALIVE SOARING LIKE A STORK (the “I AM STILL ALIVE SOARING LIKE A STORK trademark”):

– the United States trademark  with registration No. 7743240, registered on April 1, 2025, for services in International Classes 41, 44 and 45; and

– the United States trademark  with registration No. 7743241, registered on April 1, 2025, for services in International Classes 41, 44 and 45; and

- the United States trademark I AM STILL ALIVE with registration No. 7911555, registered on August 26, 2025, for services in International Classes 41, 44, and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 6, 2024. It resolves to a parking page of the Registrar containing sponsored links to the “www.amazon.com” website with keywords such as “I am alive” or “I am still alive”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants submit that in early September 2023 they introduced a third person, Mr. Desai, to the idea of their I AM STILL ALIVE oncology platform, and in October 2023, Mr. Desai became directly involved in planning the platform. In December 2023, the First Complainant transferred a significant amount of money to Mr. Desai for the funded technical engagement and related digital infrastructure of the platform. According to the Complainants, it was understood between them and Mr. Desai that the registration of the disputed domain name would be funded by the Complainants and it would serve their I AM STILL ALIVE platform. Immediately after the registration of the disputed domain name, Mr. Desai confirmed that it was done and stated that email accounts at the disputed domain name would be made available for the project. However, the disputed domain name was placed outside of the Complainants’ control and the public registration details for it were privacy-shielded. The relations between the Complainants and Mr. Desai later deteriorated and he was no longer involved in the project. Mr. Desai never transferred the disputed domain name to the Complainants, instead seeking additional compensation for his participation. The Complainants state that they continued the operations of their platform through the Third Complainant, rebuilt the platform independently, and started using the domain name <iamstillalive.com> for it.

The Complainants state that the Respondent, who is the registrant of the disputed domain name, is unknown to them. According to them, the Respondent is not an unrelated third party acting in good faith, but acts in coordination with Mr. Desai. The Complainants point out that the Registrar-disclosed registrant address is in Pune, India, where Mr. Desai's mother is also based, and that their telephone numbers are associated with the same geographic area. The Complainants maintain that, when considered together with the timing of the registration of the disputed domain name, Mr. Desai's contemporaneous communications about its purchase and the planned activation of email accounts at the disputed domain name, and his earlier references to Indian technical personnel, mentioning a name very similar to the name of the Respondent in response to requests to identify his team, and his later acknowledgment that the indicated names had been altered to conceal their identities, all this supports an inference that the Respondent coordinates his conduct with Mr. Desai. According to them, the participation of the Respondent was designed to obscure the responsibility of Mr. Desai, while preserving his leverage over the disputed domain name and complicating its recovery by the Complainants.

The Complainants state that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their I AM STILL ALIVE SOARING LIKE A STORK trademark, because it incorporates this trademark and is conceptually identical to the Complainants' domain name <iamstillalive.com> used for their oncology-focused platform.

According to the Complainants, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as it has no relevant trademark rights, is not commonly known under it, and has not used it in connection with any independent business or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair purposes. The Complainants add that the disputed domain name is inactive.

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to them, the registration and retention of the disputed domain name should be assessed as a unified course of conduct involving the Respondent and Mr. Desai. The Complainants point out that the transfer of the disputed domain name to them was conditioned by Mr. Desai on additional financial or other consideration beyond the documented out-of-pocket costs for its registration.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issue - Consolidation of the Complainants

Under paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, a Panel shall decide a request by a Party to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and the Rules.

As discussed in section 4.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), in assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple unrelated complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation.

In this proceeding, the Complaint has been submitted jointly by the three Complainants. They are affiliated to each other and have a common interest in the I AM STILL ALIVE SOARING LIKE A STORK trademark. They also describe a common grievance against the Respondent where it has allegedly engaged in a conduct that has affected their rights.

The Respondent has not expressed any views on the issue of consolidation of the Complainants, and it appears to the Panel that it would be procedurally efficient and equitable for the Complainants to be consolidated.

Taking the above into account, and on the basis of paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, the Panel allows the consolidation of the Complainants in this proceeding.

6.2. Procedural issue – Respondent Identity

The Complaint was filed against the Respondent and against Mr. Desai, and the Complainants submit that these two persons are acting in concert in relation to the disputed domain name.

The Registrar has confirmed that the Respondent is the registrant of the disputed domain name, and the Center has sent all case-related correspondence both to the Respondent and to Mr. Desai. None of them has made any communication in this proceeding or denied the existence of a relationship between them.

In this situation, the Panel finds it likely, based on the available evidence, that the Respondent is acting in concert with Mr. Desai. This alone however does not necessarily require the joining of Mr. Desai as an additional Respondent, taking also into account that this person has not attempted to participate in the proceeding. His joinder as a party is not necessary for taking his conduct into account when reaching a decision on the merits of the dispute.

Therefore, the Panel decides not to include Mr. Desai as an additional Respondent in this proceeding. Nevertheless, the Panel will take into account and consider all evidence in the case related to the conduct of Mr. Desai.

6.3. Procedural issue - Supplemental submission

The Complainants have submitted an unsolicited supplemental submission on August 19, 2026.

Paragraph 10 of the Rules vests the panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, and paragraph 12 of the Rules provides that it is for the panel to request, in its sole discretion, any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case.

As commented in section 4.6 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel, and panels have repeatedly affirmed that the party submitting or requesting to submit an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response (e.g., owing to some unforeseen or exceptional circumstance).

Having reviewed the content of the supplemental submission of the Complainants, the Panel reached the conclusion that the above conditions have not been met. The Complainants have communicated extensively with the Center in the course of this proceeding, amending their Complaint and the attached evidence a number of times, and no response has been filed. There is no justification for the acceptance of yet further statements by the Complainants and for the delays that this is likely to cause to the proceeding.

Therefore, the Panel, exercising its discretion under paragraph 12 of the Rules, decided not to accept the Complainants' supplemental submission. In any event, the Panel notes that the submission would not impact the outcome of the decision.

6.4. Substantive issues

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 Complainants have shown rights in respect of the I AM STILL ALIVE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the I AM STILL ALIVE trademark is entirely incorporated in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Since the Complainants have failed to establish that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith, there is no need to address this section.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainants submit that the disputed domain name was conceived to be used for their oncology-focused platform and was registered with funds provided by them by Mr. Desai who was engaged by them to provide technical services for the platform. They state that Mr. Desai never gave them control over the disputed domain name, and when their relations with him deteriorated he stopped being involved in the project but sought additional payments from them. According to the Complainants, the Respondent is associated with Mr. Desai and has registered and is holding the disputed domain name in coordination with Mr. Desai in order to obscure his responsibility, preserve his control over the disputed domain name, and complicate its recovery by the Complainants.

The evidence submitted by the Complainants shows that a person labelled on a messaging application with the same name as Mr. Desai participated in discussions with the other participants of the exchange (likely the Complainants themselves), where this person stated that “[v]ery soon, we will have our @iamstillalive.org emails”. There is, however, no written evidence that the Complainants discussed the registration and use of the disputed domain name with Mr. Desai, or that they have reached any kind of agreement with him on this matter. There is also no evidence about the type of relationship that the Complainants had with Mr. Desai or the Respondent. The Complainants have indicated that Mr. Desai was engaged to provide technical services (including domain name-related services), and it appears likely from the record that the Respondent was in turn engaged by Mr. Desai to implement such technical services. However, no evidence has been provided of the scope or delegation of these services or specific instructions by the Complainants (e.g., regarding what registration details to use when registering the disputed domain name).

In this situation, the circumstances surrounding the registration of the disputed domain name remain unclear to the Panel, and it is not possible to make any conclusion about the actual role and position of Mr. Desai and the Respondent in the Complainants' project, the nature of their relationship with each other and with the Complainants, and whether there was any common understanding between the Complainants and Mr. Desai and/or the Respondent as to the registration, purpose, ownership, control, and use of the disputed domain name. It may well have been that Mr. Desai arranged in good faith and with the knowledge and approval of the Complainants the registration of the disputed domain name through the Respondent for the purposes of the oncology-related project, and that the present dispute arose only later, after the breakdown of the relationship between the Complainants and Mr. Desai, where the Parties could not agree about their respective rights and obligations following the termination of their cooperation. The scarcity of the evidence

does not allow the Panel, acting within the procedural confines of the Policy, to make a different conclusion on the balance of probabilities. For somewhat similar situations, see *Q-Devco Sp. z o.o. v. Andrzej Dominik*, CAR TRONIC Andrzej Dominik, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3320](#), and *Vivatinell Limited v. Umut Ekinci*, Mikro-Gen, and Umut Ekinci, Vivatinel Kozmofarmasotik San.Ve Tic. Ltd. STI., WIPO Case No. [D2026-0391](#).

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainants have failed to establish that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

Since the Policy requires the Complainant to establish both registration and use in bad faith, the third element of the Policy has not been established, and the Complaint must fail.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: August 29, 2026