

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Modern Research LLC v. Matt Parla
Case No. D2026-3278

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Modern Research LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Davis Law LLC, United States of America.

The Respondent is Matt Parla, United States, represented by Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <modernresearchpeptides.net> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 24, 2026. On July 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 29, 2026 with the Registrar's information. The Complainant filed the amended Complaints on July 30, and August 3, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on August 7, 2026. The Respondent also sent email communications to the Center on July 27 and 30, and August 4, 2026.

On August 12, 2026, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing, and on the same day the Respondent objected to the admissibility of the Complainant's supplemental filing.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of South Carolina, United States, with a principal place of business in Westlake Village, California. The Complainant states that it has sold "research peptides and related products" under the mark MODERN PEPTIDES since at least June 2024.

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 by relevant regulators.¹

Hence, chemical suppliers such as the Complainant produce and distribute a variety of peptides that are made available expressly for research purposes as opposed to clinical or consumer use. This is evident from the Complainant's current website at "www.modern-peptides.com" (using a domain name registered on July 28, 2025, according to the WhoIs database). This website requires creating an account to log in and displays a notice that "all products are designated solely for laboratory research purposes and are not approved for clinical, diagnostic, veterinary, consumer, or investigational use outside controlled research settings". The landing page displays a figurative logo featuring the name "Modern Petptides", albeit without a trademark symbol.

The Complainant formerly operated a website at "www.modernpeptides.com" (the domain name <modernpeptides.com> was registered on June 5, 2024), which, according to Google Search Console results, attracted approximately 2.2 million impressions and 120,000 clicks in the three-month period from November 2025 through January 2026. The Panel in a previous UDRP proceeding, *Modern Research LLC v. Wilz King, Pablo Benzs, leon van beek beek, Bove Thomas B.T., My Clients, Web designer*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1150](#) ("*Modern Research v. Wilz King*"), relied heavily on this documented website traffic to find that the Complainant had established common law rights in MODERN PEPTIDES as a word mark. ("While the evidence from the Complainant is thin, it has produced a screenshot of its MODERN PEPTIDES-branded website, as well as of substantial visitor numbers to that website. In the Panel's view, this information just about suffices to establish unregistered trade mark rights.")

The Complainant also reports two pending applications with the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") to register MODERN PEPTIDES, one as a word mark (Serial Number 99694341 filed March 10, 2026) and the other as a composite mark, the logo displayed both on its current and former website (Serial Number 99694463 filed March 10, 2026), claiming first use in commerce for both marks as early as June 5, 2024, when the Complainant's domain name <modernpeptides.com> was registered. Both applications are pending at the time of this Decision. According to the USPTO database, USPTO issued a Notice of Non-Final Office Action on the application for a word mark (Serial Number 99694341) on June 30, 2026, citing a likelihood of confusion with registered MODERNA marks and requiring disclaimer of the right to use "peptides" apart from the mark as shown.

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.; <https://www.webmd.com/a-to-z-guides/what-are-peptides>

Similarly, USPTO issued a Notice of Non-Final Office Action on the Complainant's application for registration of a composite mark (Serial Number 99694463) on July 16, 2026, on the same ground and with the same recommended disclaimer.

The disputed domain name was created on September 3, 2025, and is registered to the Respondent Matt Parla, listing no organization, a postal address in the State of South Carolina, United States, and a Gmail contact email address. The disputed domain name resolves to a landing page with a logo composed of the "MRP" logo in capital letters over the name "MODERN RESEARCH PEPTIDES" and a notice that the website is for "Professional research use only":

"Products displayed and sold on this website are supplied for laboratory, analytical, and research purposes only. Nothing presented here is intended for human consumption, medical use, veterinary use, diagnosis, treatment, cure, or prevention of disease."

This notice is followed by a checkbox requiring the site visitor to confirm that the visitor is 21 years of age or older and understands that the products are for "research use only". The user may then enter the website and shop for "high-purity peptides", with "fast fulfillment" and "[d]iscreet, unbranded packaging to protect your privacy". Many of the peptides sold on the Respondent's website appear to overlap products sold by the Complainant, based on screenshots of the Parties' websites. The copyright notice on the website is in the name of "Modern Research Peptides", and the "Contact" page, which solicits site visitors' contact information, furnishes the same Gmail address for the Respondent that was used for the registration of the disputed domain name but does not otherwise identify company location or contact details. A notice at the bottom of the Respondent's website says this about the website operator:

"Modern Research Peptides is a chemical supplier. Modern Research Peptides is not a compounding pharmacy or chemical compounding facility as defined under 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Modern Research Peptides is not an outsourcing facility as defined under 503B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act."

The "Terms and Conditions" page says that users of the website must be 18 or older and emphasizes that all products are "for laboratory research purposes only" and that nothing on the site is meant as medical advice. The "Governing Law" section provides that the Terms and Conditions are governed "in accordance with the laws of the state in which Modern Research Peptides operates", which is not indicated.

The Response was filed on behalf of Modern Research Peptides LLC, a South Carolina, United States, limited liability company formed in August 2025. The Panel notes that the online database of the South Carolina Secretary of State confirms that Modern Research Peptides LLC is an active South Carolina limited liability company established effective August 10, 2025, with the Respondent listed as the registered agent.

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 it has common law rights in MODERN PEPTIDES as a word mark through continuous use since at least June 2024 and points to the previous UDRP ruling to that effect in *Modern Research v. Wilz King*. The Complainant also refers to "millions in revenue, thousands of transactions, substantial marketing investment", although these statements are not accompanied by supporting evidence.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its MODERN PEPTIDES mark, inserting only the word “research”, which is “drawn directly” from the Complainant’s corporate name. The Complaint argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as it has no license from the Complainant and “mere formation of a corporate entity does not, by itself, establish that a Respondent is ‘commonly known’” by the disputed domain name and would not represent a legitimate interest where the entity was established to capitalize on the Complainant’s pre-existing mark. The Complainant points out that the Respondent was formed more than a year after the Complainant’s first use of the mark. The Complainant contends that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for a directly competing “research peptide” business does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services, as it is passing off its products as those of a competitor using a deceptively similar name.

The Complainant argues that this conduct also represents bad faith under the Policy, as it is “inconceivable” that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant operating in the same niche industry with a similar and distinctive name. The choice of name could not be coincidental, according to the Complainant, and even a cursory search would have revealed the Complainant’s website and similar domain name and the Complainant’s company name including the intervening word “research” used in the disputed domain name, further evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant. The Complainant suggests that the Respondent’s conduct is similar to that of the multiple respondents in the *Modern Research v. Wilz King* proceeding who targeted the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant also shows that there is confusion between the Parties’ websites in Google search engine results, and thus actual diversion of Internet users through the creation of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant argues further that this confusion is compounded by the fact that the Respondent’s website requires entry through a sign-in page, which means that search engine results and rankings depend only on the domain name and landing page, making the Parties’ websites seem even more similar, and the Complainant infers bad faith from these effects. Otherwise, the Complainant cites one online chat exchange as an example of customer confusion.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent argues first that the Complainant cannot rely on the applied-for trademark registrations, given their current status, and that the Complainant has not furnished persuasive evidence to support its claims of common-law trademark protection for MODERN PEPTIDES as a mark at the time when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent says that Modern Research Peptides LLC (hereafter “MRP”), formed in August 2025, was named descriptively for the nature of its products and that its initials “MRP” also correspond to the initials of its principal’s name, Matthew R. Parla. The Respondent insists that it named its business independently and created its own branding, logo, and product listings and had “never heard of Complainant” until this proceeding.

The Respondent points out that unlike the respondents in the *Modern Research v. Wilz King* proceeding, with whom the Respondent has no connection, the Respondent did not copy the Complainant’s logo or website. The Respondent produced its own branding, product line, and content, which are materially different from the Complainant’s and those involved in the earlier WIPO proceeding. Thus, the Respondent claims to be operating a bona fide business under a descriptive name corresponding exactly to the disputed domain name, without intent to imitate the Complainant’s claimed mark. The Respondent denies any bad-faith intent to target the Complainant’s mark.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Supplemental Filings

The Rules provide for a complaint and response and do not contemplate repeated amendments and supplemental filings. Paragraph 10 of the Rules gives the Panel “the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition”. Paragraph 12 provides that it is in the Panel’s sole discretion to request further statements or documents from the parties. Unsolicited filings are generally discouraged and tend to be permitted exceptionally where additional supporting evidence is required, a relevant claim has not been addressed, or fairness calls for an opportunity to respond to the opposing party. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 4.6, 4.7.

Here, the Complainant submitted a supplemental filing disputing the Respondent’s characterization of the USPTO’s Non-Final Actions on the Complainant’s pending trademark applications but concedes that the Complainant “does not rely” on the pending applications “alone”. That is wise, because they would not, of course, ground a UDRP complaint; they do not reflect an existing trademark right. The Complainant also rebuts the Respondent’s arguments based on its assertion that the Complainant has not proved any use of the claimed MODERN PEPTIDES mark in 2024 and the recency of its current website at the time the disputed domain name was registered. As the Complainant correctly points out, this overlooks the Complainant’s use of MODERN PEPTIDES word and composite marks on its former website since June 2024. But the Panel is well aware of this evidence and argument, which was furnished with the Complaint.

What is potentially more significant is that the Complainant introduces evidence of new developments since the filing of the Complaint: changes in the Respondent’s website under the disputed domain name that purportedly undermine the Respondent’s claims that the site was not meant to target the Complainant. The Panel will examine the supplemental filing for this limited purpose. Rather than replying to this supplemental filing when it had the opportunity, the Respondent sent an “objection” to it, without articulating reasons, but requested an opportunity to “provide further statements” if the Panel determined that any of the issues raised in the Complainant’s supplemental filing were relevant to the Decision. The Panel declines this suggestion to further delay the proceeding. In any case, noting the outcome, the Panel does not consider that the Respondent was disadvantaged by the Panel’s acceptance of the Complainant’s supplemental filing into the record.

6.2. 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 Complainant lacks a registered mark, and its claimed common law mark is composed of two descriptive, dictionary terms. The Complainant’s United States trademark registration applications are pending and problematic; following recent Non-Final Action letters; they are of no use here to establish the Complainant’s rights for purposes of the first element. The Panel in *Modern Research v. Wilz King* found common law rights based on the high volume of Google Search Console Results in late 2025 and early 2026 on the Complainant’s former website, which “just about suffices” to establish common law protection for MODERN PEPTIDES. This is still true, even though the Complainant has not, in this proceeding, offered further evidence of sales, advertising, media mentions, industry or consumer recognition to support its claim of acquired distinctiveness ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3).

The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, as both “modern” and “peptides” appear in 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, the dictionary word “research”) 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 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.

The Panel finds that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2. The Complainant argues that the Respondent should be viewed the same as those in *Modern Research v. Wilz King*, who did not file a response and who were clearly copycats with no evidence of operating a legitimate business. The respondents in that proceeding not only mimicked the Complainant’s domain name but also – for the majority of the domain names involved in that dispute – its website, copying the Complainant’s logo and website text and images and even its contact details. By contrast, the Respondent established and registered a company with a name that differs from the Complainant’s, registered a corresponding domain name, created its own logo that is visually different (atomic rather than molecular), generated its own product line with descriptions, images, and pricing, to all appearances operate an actual business, hired legal counsel and responded to the Complaint. The Complainant argues that this does not represent a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name because the choice of business name was driven by an intent to target the Complainant’s common law mark. That argument is weighed in the following section on the bad faith element.

The Panel does not reach a finding as to whether the Respondent has been “commonly known” by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence concerning the volume of site visitors to the Respondent’s website, for example, and while the Response claims 27,000 customers, there is no supporting evidence for this figure. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established, subject to the discussion of bad faith below.

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. These circumstances described in Paragraph 4(a), such as (iii) disrupting the business of a competitor or (iv) intentionally

attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark, could possibly be imputed to the Respondent if the facts indicated the likelihood that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and registered and then used the disputed domain name in an effort to exploit or attack the Complainant's reputation associated with the Complainant's common law MODERN PEPTIDES mark. The Respondent denies such awareness and intent at the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant offers no direct evidence of such awareness and intent in the case of the Respondent but suggests that the Respondent is similar to the respondents in *Modern Research v. Wilz King*. As detailed above, the Respondent here did not act as they did, blatantly copying the Complainant's website (down to the logo and contact details) and appears instead to be carrying on its own business instead selling research peptides. Even the Complaint uses the term "research peptides" generically, saying that both Parties are in the business of selling those products.

The salient question is whether the Respondent genuinely was unaware of the Complainant and did not intend, in choosing the business name and corresponding domain name, to exploit the Complainant's existing and growing reputation. The Panel notes that the Complainant's website at its former domain name was popular by September 3, 2025, and the Complainant also had by then registered multiple other domain names incorporating "modern peptides", which were unavailable for the Respondent to register if had attempted to do so. But the Respondent cites plausible reasons for choosing the name "Modern Research Peptides" (importantly, not "Modern Peptides"), and the Complainant overstates the case that anyone entering the field of research peptides in early September 2025 would necessarily have discovered the Complainant in setting up their online business. The Panel, for example, conducted Google searches with a United States-based browser set for the 30-day period ending September 3, 2025, using "modern research peptides" as the query and did not find the Complainant in the first five screens of search results. Thus, it was not "inconceivable" as the Complainant insists, that the Respondent would be unaware of the Complainant in September 2025.

The Complainant argues that one instance of customer confusion in a chat thread also is probative of bad faith, but this is hardly dispositive; it does not prove that the Respondent chose its descriptive business name to create confusion with the Complainant, which also has a rather descriptive name and mark. The two are likely to lead to some confusion, but this does not necessarily mean it was intended. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent deliberately exacerbated confusion by using a "log-on" screen to keep search engines from crawling its entire website, with the result that the search engines incorrectly matched the Parties' websites only by looking at the Respondent's confusingly similar disputed domain name. The Complainant's supplemental filing shows that the Respondent has recently made more of its website available for search engine crawling, suggesting that this was influenced by the filing of the Complaint and indicates a bad faith effort to cover up the earlier practice of misleading the search engines. The Panel notes that both Parties use landing pages to deliver notices about age and use restrictions on their websites and require users to take action to access pages deeper in their sites. The Respondent's screen has recently become less restrictive, asking now only about age and consent to the Respondent's use restrictions. The Complainant provides a search engine optimization ("SEO") report showing that before recent changes following the Complaint, the Respondent's website was discovered most often in searches also associated with the Complainant, inferring that the Respondent previously configured the website to create confusion with the Complainant. The Panel notes that this could be explained by other reasons for allowing more search engine access and the fact that the Respondent's website content is not, in fact, imitative of the Complainant's, a fact that supports the Respondent's claims to an independent business offering. In sum, the Panel finds these arguments equivocal rather than persuasive on the issue of bad faith intent.

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.

Given this assessment of the relevant facts and arguments, the Panel also confirms its finding under the second Policy element.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2026