

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TruHlth Holdings Inc. v. Rahman Jago
Case No. D2026-3592

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Rahman Jago, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <biolongevity-labss.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 12, 2026. On August 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 14, 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 verified that the 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on September 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 October 7, 2026, the Panel issued a Procedural Order inviting the Complainant to provide further evidence of use of the disputed domain name and the Respondent to comment on this submission. The Complainant provided its reply on October 12, 2026. The Respondent did not provide any comments.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, a company with its main offices in Ohio, United States, markets specialized chemicals, namely, peptides for use in scientific research and in nutritional supplements.

It is the proprietor of the following trademark registrations:

- United Kingdom Trade Mark No. UK00004304135 for BIOLONGEVITY LABS (word mark), registered on February 27, 2026 for goods in classes 1 and 5; and
- European Union Trade Mark No. 019286841 for BIOLONGEVITY LABS (word mark), registered on April 26, 2026 for goods in classes 1 and 5.

The record contains an undated printout of the Complainant's primary website at the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com>. The Complainant registered this domain name on June 13, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 25, 2026. At the time of this Decision, it did not resolve to an active website. Following the Panel's request for information, the Complainant provided evidence that it previously resolved to a website purporting to be operated by "Biolongevity Labs". This website was similar in color, images and layout to the Complainant's website and purported to offer identical products for sale. The website states "Biolongevity Labs has established itself as the premier source for research-grade amino acid sequences and cellular reagents".

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 used the BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark in commerce in the United States since at least as early as November 2024. The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's mark and domain name only by the addition of a hyphen and the letter "s". The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has no rights to use its mark. The only reason for registering the disputed domain name was to disrupt the Complainant's business and divert traffic intended for the Complainant. The Respondent's website displays the Complainant's BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark and copyrighted artwork.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 Panel finds the BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, as it is reproduced in its entirety, with the insertion of a hyphen and an additional letter “s”, which is a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant’s mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9

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.

The composition of the disputed domain name, which reflects the Complainant's BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark with a hyphen and an additional letter "s", coupled with its use to resolve to a website in which the Respondent tries to impersonate the Complainant, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

The Respondent does not rebut the Complainant's assertion that the Parties are unrelated. The evidence indicates that the Respondent's website purports to be operated by "Biolongevity Labs", displaying the Complainant's mark and images of its products without any disclaimer of the lack of relationship between the Parties. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed 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 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 Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The disputed domain name was registered shortly after the Complainant registered its BIOLONGEVITY LABS trademark. It reflects a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's mark. Moreover, the Panel finds that the similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's domain name <biolongevitylabs.com>, which was registered about two years prior to the disputed domain name, further supports a finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. The Panel is of the view that the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademark. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.

The record contains un rebutted evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring the Complainant's mark and purporting to be operated by "Biolongevity Labs". This website was similar in color, images and layout to the Complainant's website and purported to offer identical products for sale. Such conduct is clearly indicative of bad faith use of the disputed domain name. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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

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-labss.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa /

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: October 22, 2026