ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trividia Health, Inc. v. jun yan
Case No. D2026-3352

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trividia Health, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is jun yan, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <truemetrixstore.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 28, 2026. On July 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 31, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 3, 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 August 6, 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant, founded in 1985, is a large United States manufacturer of store brand products for individuals with diabetes, including a broad portfolio of blood glucose monitoring supplies and technologies which are marketed throughout the United States and international markets. Among those products is the True Metrix line of self-monitoring blood-glucose systems, which consists of blood glucose meters and test strips.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for TRUE METRIX in various jurisdictions including the United States and China, including the wordmark registration in the United States, No. 4.637.504, registered November 11, 2024, for goods in classes 5 and 10, and the registration in China, No. 19033152, registered on March 7, 2017, for goods in class 10.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 24, 2025. On May 8, 2026, it resolved to an extensive website displaying the Complainant's TRUE METRIX trademark, and which purportedly offers TRUE METRIX branded products, including self-monitoring blood glucose strips. At the bottom of the page the following text is included: "TrueMetrixStore. At True Metrix, we're dedicated to providing reliable diabetes management solutions. Our comprehensive range includes the True Metrix blood glucose meter, test strips, lancets, and control solution—everything you need for accurate monitoring and peace of mind. Copyright© 2025 truemetrixstore.com. All rights reserved." At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name did not resolve to any active page.

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 incorporates the Complainant's TRUE METRIX mark in full, changing the mark only by adding the generic term "store".

There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic to a website that impersonates the Complainant's website. This website purports to provide general information about the Complainant and its True Metrix products. The website prominently displays the TRUE METRIX mark in the top left corner of the website, which mirrors the placement of the TRIVIDIA HEALTH mark on the official Trividia Health website. The website displays specific language on the homepage which makes clear the website is attempting to impersonate the Complainant, including the text as included under Section 4 of this Decision.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent's website to disrupt the Complainant's business and for commercial gain.

The Respondent's website also included false contact information.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("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 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 "store", 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.

Having reviewed the available 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.

Moreover, in addition to lacking a response, the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, clearly tries to create the impression as if it is operated by the Complainant, and coupled with the composition of the disputed domain name, it effectively leads to impersonation or suggestion of sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1. As it is beyond any doubt that there is no bona fide offering of goods, the Panel does not have to apply the cumulative requirements of the so-called 'Oki Data test' (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903). In any event, the requirement that the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder is clearly not met in this case.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its consideration under 6.B.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its reputation in the TRUE METRIX Mark at the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent has provided no explanation, and neither is it immediately obvious, why an entity would register a domain name that wholly incorporates the TRUE METRIX mark and direct it to a website purportedly offering glucose monitoring products under the Complainant's TRUE METRIX mark (non-complying with the requirements of the Oki Data test) unless there was an awareness of and an intention to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its TRUE METRIX mark.

As considered above, the Respondent's website contains false statements that imply that the Respondent's website is operated by the Complainant. The registration of the disputed domain name in awareness of the TRUE METRIX mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has passed off as the Complainant and purported to offer glucose monitoring products, be they genuine or otherwise, under the Complainant's TRUE METRIX mark on the Respondent's website without the Complainant's approval and without meeting the Oki Data test. The Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the TRUE METRIX mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

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 <truemetrixstore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/
Willem J. H. Leppink
Sole Panelist
Date: September 15, 2026