

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Koi CBD, LLC v. Deepanshu Bedi, Blue Ribbon Group LLC and
Koi Research Labs LLC
Case No. D2026-2993

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Koi CBD, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by The Myers Law Group, United States.

The Respondent is Deepanshu Bedi, Blue Ribbon Group LLC, United States, and Koi Research Labs LLC, United States, represented by Kade Ventures, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <koipeptides.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 8, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 9, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 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 amended Complaint on July 16, 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 August 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 30, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center between July 16 and August 29, 2026, including two Responses filed on August 4 and August

10, 2026, respectively. On August 29, 2026, the Respondent requested the four-day automatic extension pursuant to paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. On August 31, 2026, the Center confirmed that the Response due date was extended to September 3, 2026 under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. The Response was filed with the Center on September 3, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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 a California (United States) limited liability company engaged in the sale of cannabidiol (CBD) and related products. According to the online database of the California Secretary of State, the Complainant was first registered on January 29, 2016, and has its principal place of business in Norwalk, California.¹ The Panel notes that the Complainant operates a website at “www.koicbd.com” (the “Complainant’s website”), which advertises a variety of CBD and THC (tetrahydrocannabinol) products derived from cannabis. The Complainant’s website displays a logo featuring the word “Koi” and an illustration of a koi fish.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations, including United States Registration Number 6681784 (registered on March 29, 2022 with a first use in commerce dated 2018) for the word mark KOI in international class 3 and United States Registration Number 7654659 (registered on January 14, 2025 with a first use in commerce dated 2023) for the word mark KOI in international class 5. The Complainant claims that, since at least as early as 2017, it has offered goods/services in commerce under the name KOI.

The disputed domain name was created on April 21, 2026, and according to the Registrar’s verification, is registered to the Respondent Deepanshu Bedi of the organization Blue Ribbon Group LLC, listing a postal address in Glendale, California, United States and a Gmail contact email address.

The disputed domain name resolves to an age-restricted website (the “Respondent’s website”) selling research-grade peptides. The website requires users to certify that they are purchasing the products only for research purposes. The Panel notes that, as described in the WebMD.com article on “Peptides: Types, Uses, and Benefits”, peptides are short strings of amino acids (such as insulin), some of which have well-established therapeutic applications. Others have been used in dietary supplements, cosmetics, muscle-building, anti-aging, and fat-loss products. Not all are thoroughly tested and currently approved for medical, veterinary, or consumer use by relevant regulators. Hence, suppliers such as the Respondent make a variety of peptides available for research purposes.

The Respondent’s website identifies its “registered office” as “Koi Research Labs LLC” with an address in Sheridan, Wyoming, United States and provides contact details. The Panel notes that Koi Research Labs LLC is listed in the online database of the Wyoming Secretary of State as an active Wyoming limited liability company formed on May 4, 2026. The Response has this to say concerning the relationship between the registrant of the disputed domain name and Koi Research Labs LLC:

“The Respondent invites the Panel to treat Koi Research Labs LLC as the substantive Respondent in this proceeding. It is that entity, and not the registrant of record, which operates the business conducted through the disputed domain name, which is named on the website, which holds the supplier and fulfillment relationships, and against which the substance of the Complaint is in truth directed. The registrant of record holds the domain name registration on that entity’s behalf; the disclosed registrant details reflect a

¹ Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

registration and administrative arrangement rather than the beneficial ownership or operation of the disputed domain name or of the business conducted through it.”

In addition, the Complainant has also named both “Koi Research Labs LLC” and “Deepanshu Bedi, Blue Ribbon Group LLC” as the Respondent in the Complaint.

Given these facts, the Panel refers hereafter to “Deepanshu Bedi, Blue Ribbon Group LLC”, and “Koi Research Labs LLC” collectively as the “Respondent” unless otherwise indicated.

The Respondent reports that the Parties engaged in correspondence in June, July, and August 2026 concerning the disputed domain name, including discussion of a possible settlement. The Parties did not reach an agreement.

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 the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its registered KOI marks, especially considering that some of those cover “nutritional supplements”, and some peptides are sold as nutritional supplements. The disputed domain name incorporates the mark in its entirety and adds the word “peptides”, which is susceptible to confusion.

The Complainant appears to argue that the Respondent can have no *legitimate* interest in the disputed domain name, noting that the Respondent was not authorized to use the KOI mark, that the entity Koi Research Labs LLC was formed nine years after the Complainant first began using its KOI mark, and that the Respondent uses KOI in connection with products that the Complainant considers related to its nutritional supplement products.

The Complainant also asserts bad faith on the part of the Respondent, arguing that the Complainant’s KOI brand was well known within the same industry of nutritional supplements “which includes peptides” and that the Respondent had “constructive knowledge” of the Complainant’s trademark registrations.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent notes that the Complainant’s mark is a dictionary word “in extensive independent commercial use by numerous unrelated undertakings” and that the addition of “peptides” is descriptive of the Respondent’s business not the Complainant’s. The Respondent argues that even if the Complainant has standing for Policy purposes, the Complaint fails on both the second and third elements.

The Respondent observes that its principals reside in India and established a Wyoming limited liability company to conduct a legitimate online business selling research peptides, which does not compete with the Complainant’s cannabis business. Even the Complainant’s annexes demonstrate that the Respondent operates a genuine e-commerce business that makes no reference to the Complainant or its products and does not imitate the Complainant’s logo or website in any way. The Respondent notes that UDRP panels have not broadly accepted the notion that constructive notice alone suffices to establish bad faith intent to exploit a trademark.

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 (the registered KOI 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "peptides") 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The record includes evidence that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with an offering of research peptide products, as described above. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2. The record includes documentation not only of the Respondent's website but of third-party Certificates of Analysis of the Respondent's peptide products offered under the client name "Koi Peptides".

The record also shows that the Respondent adopted the business name Koi Research Labs LLC, although the Panel notes that the company was formed on May 4, 2026, shortly after the disputed domain name was registered on April 21, 2026. The website subsequently identified Koi Research Labs LLC as the business associated with the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established, subject to assessment of the Complainant's argument that the Respondent chose its company name as well in bad faith to target the Complainant's mark, and thus that the Respondent is not engaging in a "bona fide" offering of goods or services and cannot make a claim to a "legitimate" interest in the disputed domain name. That evaluation is best conducted in tandem with the analysis of the evidence on bad faith in the following section.

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. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) articulates the example of a respondent who intentionally attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark, which the Complainant suspects in this case.

This presupposes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark and harbored such intent, which the Respondent denies. The Complainant relies on constructive knowledge of its registered marks (not generally accepted as sufficient evidence of bad faith) and infers actual knowledge of its "well-known" marks in the "nutritional supplements" industry. But the Complainant's argument is not persuasive in trying to place its cannabis products in such a broad category that the Respondent entering the market to sell research peptides online would necessarily be aware of the Complainant and the mark. Neither Party's website expressly markets "nutritional supplements". Rather, each retails a limited range of separate and regulated products, and the Respondent expressly markets its products for research use only. Moreover,

“koi” is a dictionary word with an ordinary meaning independent of the Complainant, and the record does not establish that it is so strongly associated with the Complainant that the Respondent’s awareness and targeting may be inferred from the mark alone. An Internet search on the term by the Panel located in the United States does not produce any results relating to the Complainant in the first five screens. Moreover, the Global Brand Database reflects numerous trademark registrations for or incorporating the term “Koi” owned by a range of unrelated parties in multiple jurisdictions. This supports the conclusion that “Koi” has been adopted and used as a trademark by many different businesses and is not exclusively associated with the Complainant. Thus, the Panel is not inclined on this record to discount the Respondent’s denial and find that it “must have” meant to target the Complainant’s KOI mark.

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 the third element of the Policy has not been established.

Based on this analysis of the same facts, the Panel also confirms its finding that the second element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026