

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TruHlth Holdings Inc. v. James Harry, palais de lux
Case No. D2026-3005

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is James Harry, palais de lux, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <biolongevity-lab.com> 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 24, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. 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 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. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 28, 2026. The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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

Complainant is a corporation based in the United States. Since November 2024, Complainant has offered various scientific or wellness products, particularly in the peptide- and bioregulator-related fields, under the mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS. Complainant has filed trademark applications for its BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark in various jurisdictions. Complainant owns registered trademarks for BIOLONGEVITY LABS: United Kingdom (“UK”) Registration No UK00004304135 (registered February 27, 2026); and European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”) Registration No. 19286841 (registered April 26, 2026). Complainant also owns subsisting applications in the United States, including United States Application Nos. 99344809 (filed August 19, 2025) for BIOLONGEVITY LABS and 99848742 for a design mark.¹

The disputed domain name was registered on March 24, 2026. Although Complainant did not provide evidence of the disputed domain name’s use, the Panel conducted a limited independent search and notes that Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics an official website by Complainant, including prominent display of Complainant’s word and design marks without any disclaimer of affiliation, including in the copyright notice appearing at the bottom of the website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the BIOLONGEVITY LABS for various scientific or wellness products, for which it has rights pending in various jurisdictions. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name clearly references Complainant’s BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark, with only the addition of a hyphen and the omission of the letter “s”. Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is highly similar to Complainant’s own domain name <biolongevitylabs.com> (registered June 13, 2024).

Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, presumably for Respondent’s own commercial gain, by creating a website whose “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”.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

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 Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark, for the purposes of the Policy.

¹ Although the record provided by Complainant did not contain the most updated information on the status of the three noted applications, the Panel independently confirmed the updated status with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), UK, and the EUIPO records respectively, including the issuance of the UK and EUIPO registration. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

Prior UDRP panels have indicated that a reseller may be considered to have rights or legitimate interests in a mark, provided certain requirements are met. These generally include that: (i) the site is actually offering the goods at issue; (ii) the site is used only to sell the trademarked goods; (ii) the site accurately and prominently discloses the registrant’s relationship to the mark holder; and (iii) respondent does not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8; see also *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The Panel finds that these qualifications are not fulfilled by the website associated with the disputed domain name. Rather, to the extent that any legitimate goods or services may be offered via the disputed domain name, the associated website does not appear to include a disclaimer of affiliation or endorsement by Complainant, and rather includes unauthorized display of Complainant’s marks, the copyright notice at the bottom of the website in the name of “BioLongevity Labs” and a statement “At BIOLONGEVITY LABS, we are dedicated to supporting the scientific community by supplying high-quality peptides [...]”. Respondent has not put forward any claims or evidence that would suggest rights or legitimate interests for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics an official website by Complainant, with prominent display of Complainant’s marks, and with no disclaimer of affiliation, displaying, on the contrary, the copyright notice in the name of “BioLongevity Labs” and the above statement suggesting that the website is operated or endorsed by Complainant. Furthermore, the UK trademark registration for BIOLONGEVITY LABS predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s rights and Complainant’s marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <biolongevity-lab.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2026