ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
TruHlth Holdings Inc. v. NBA SKIDICE
Case No. D2026-3004

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is NBA SKIDICE, Cameroon.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <biolongevitylabsco.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Dynadot 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 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 23, 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 (John Doe, Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 24, 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 29, 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 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on September 7, 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 September 18, 2026, the Panel issued an administrative Procedural Order inviting the Complainant to provide the evidence demonstrating the use of the Disputed Domain Name, and the Respondent to submit comments on such submissions. The Parties did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties' default on September 30, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, a United States entity, is the owner of the BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark, used in commerce in relation to peptide and bioregulator related products and services.

The Complainant holds trademark rights for BIOLONGEVITY LABS, such as the following:

- the United Kingdom Trademark registration number UK00004304135 for BIOLONGEVITY LABS (word), filed on December 2, 2025, registered on February 27, 2026, covering goods in International Classes 1 and 5; and

- the European Union Trademark registration number 019286841 for BIOLONGEVITY LABS (word), filed on December 4, 2025, registered on April 26, 2026, covering goods in International Classes 1 and 5.

The Complainant owns <biolongevitylabs.com> (its official website) registered on June 13, 2024.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 29, 2026, and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it did not resolve to an active website (landing to an error page).

The Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name was used in relation to a website displaying its BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark and copyrighted artwork, but it fails to provide the evidence of such use.

The Respondent was involved in a prior UDRP dispute, involving the Complainant and its BIOLONGEVITY LABS marks, which decided against it[1]. See *TruHlth Holdings Inc. v. nba skidice*, WIPO Case No. D2026-2166.

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 the following:

- the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark, the addition of the element "co" is a minor variation which does not create any significant distinction from the Complainant's trademark;

[1] See the general powers of a panel to 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.

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name mainly because: (i) the Disputed Domain Name directs web traffic away from the Complainant and its only function is to divert business, capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill, and interfere with the Complainant's online presence in the peptide and bioregulator related fields; and (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, has no legitimate rights nor is making a noncommercial, fair use of the Disputed Domain Name;

- the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly because: (i) the Disputed Domain Name was registered after the Complainant had established rights in BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark and domain name; (ii) by using the Disputed Domain Name the Respondent has intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users searching the Complainant to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves; and (iii) the Respondent's bad-faith conduct is further demonstrated by its use of the Complainant's BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark and copyrighted artwork throughout the website under the Disputed Domain Name and this confirms the Respondent's intent to mislead consumers, trade on the Complainant's goodwill, and divert traffic for its own commercial benefit.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, or to the Procedural Order.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

(i) the Disputed 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 the Disputed Domain Name; and
(iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

While the addition of other term, here, "co", 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

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 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the 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 Panel further notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself carries a risk of implied affiliation given the Complainant's trademark BIOLONGEVITY LABS has been reproduced in the Disputed Domain Name together with an additional two-letter term, and considering the Complainant's own highly similar 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered, more likely than not, in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark, particularly because it incorporates the Complainant's mark with an additional two letter term, "co", that can be perceived as an abbreviation for various names potentially associated with the Complainant and its industry such as: "company" or "Cobalt/Carbon Monoxide" or other scientific abbreviations/elements used in biotech. Also, the Complainant's mark and domain name predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name, with about two years for the Complainant's domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a website displaying its BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark and copyrighted artwork and submitted that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name to seek to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. However, the Complainant did not provide supporting evidence, and the Panel's searches, on the Internet Archive, did not reveal compelling evidence to support such allegations.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name did not resolve to an active website. Prior panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the composition of the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent's failure to come forward with any evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent's use of a privacy shield and the provision of inaccurate/incomplete contact information in registration data of the Disputed Domain Name; the implausibility of any good faith use to which the

Disputed Domain Name may be put, 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. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

In addition, paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy lists the situation when the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct. A bad faith pattern requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registrations, and includes a scenario where the respondent, on separate occasions, registered trademark-abusive domain names even where directed at the same brand owner. Here, the Respondent was involved in at least one prior UDRP procedure, as detailed on Section 4 above. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has established a pattern of bad faith conduct. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2.

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, <biolongevitylabsco.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/
Marilena Comanescu
Sole Panelist
Date: October 1, 2026