

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TruHlth Holdings Inc. v. tashi kelvin
Case No. D2026-3597

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is tashi kelvin, Lithuania.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <shopbiolongevitylabs.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 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 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 August 14, 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 18, 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 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 Respondent’s default on September 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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 US-based manufacturer of research-grade peptides and bioregulators and is being using the mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS in the United States since November 2024. It has filed trademark applications and owns trademark registrations containing the mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS:

- United Kingdom trademark registration for BIOLONGEVITY LABS (word), Trademark No UK00004304135, registered February 27, 2026; and
- United States trademark application for , Serial No 99848742, filing date May 27, 2026 (Annex A to the Complaint; Panel's own research¹), registered September 22, 2026.

The Complainant has registered the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com> on June 13, 2024; the domain name resolves to a website where the Complainant offers its products for sale by displaying various product photos as well as the mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS and the logo  (Annex A to the Complaint)..

The disputed domain name was registered on April 1, 2026. The Complainant alleges without providing evidence that at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website where the Complainant's products were offered for sale by displaying the Complainant's mark. At the time of this Decision, it resolves to a website, displaying the Complainant's logo , mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS and product photos. The product photos displayed on the website addressed by the disputed domain name are identical to those of the Complainant's website; there is no disclaimer on that online store clarifying that the shop is not controlled or authorized by the Complainant; rather, it repeatedly refers to "BioLongevity Labs" and "our catalog."

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 is the owner of trademark applications for the word mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS and has used this mark since at least as early as November 2024. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark since it only adds the term "shop" as prefix and the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".com". These minor variations do not create any significant distinction from the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant moreover owns and operates the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com> which was registered on June 13, 2024. The disputed domain name <shopbiolongevitylabs.com> is also confusingly similar to the Complainant's domain name <biolongevitylabs.com>.

The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to use the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or has a noncommercial, fair use, or other legitimate rights – it is the contrary: the disputed domain name directs web traffic away from the

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") section 4.8.

Complainant and provides no legitimate benefit to the Respondent. Their 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.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith: the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant had established its rights in the trademark BIOLONGEVITY LABS and had registered the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com>. Further, the Respondent's bad-faith conduct is further demonstrated by its use of the Complainant's BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark and copyrighted artwork throughout its website which was addressed by the disputed domain name. In doing so, the Respondent's intent is to mislead consumers, trade on the Complainant's goodwill, and divert traffic for its own commercial benefit. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name serves no other purpose than to intentionally, and in bad faith, direct traffic away from the Complainant's website and to their own website

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (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 with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

To make out a successful Complaint the Complainant must prove all three elements under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 rights in the mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS under the Policy, since such rights must be in existence at the time the complaint is filed – this is the case at present. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark since that mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name merely adds the term "shop" as prefix to the BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark.

It has long been established under UDRP decisions that adding descriptive or other terms to a trademark, here, the term "shop," does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Finally, it has also long been held that TLDs (here ".com") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to use its trademark in any manner including in a domain name. Moreover, the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name or has demonstrated a fair use of the disputed domain name – it is to the contrary: the composition of the disputed domain name, coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to host a website where the Complainant’s products were offered for sale by posing as the Complainant and displaying the Complainant’s logo, mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS as well as product photos, affirms 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 at the disputed domain name.

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

Finally, there is no disclaimer at the website accessible through the disputed domain name that disclosed the lack of the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant. Rather, it appears that the Respondent has purposely attempted to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s mark and the purported connection with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8; and *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The Respondent did not reply to the Complaint and has not rebutted the Complainant’s contentions.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy, both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith; and
- the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

(i) In the present case, the Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates that it has rights and is the owner of the registered trademark BIOLONGEVITY LABS. The Complainant has registered the BIOLONGEVITY LABS mark and has used this mark before registration of the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant has registered the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com> on June 13, 2024, and uses this domain name for hosting its business website.

Therefore, it is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant or its rights, since the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark BIOLONGEVITY LABS entirely and merely adds the descriptive term “shop” as

prefix, which even strengthens this finding, as it may be perceived as related to the Complainant's sales efforts.

The Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

(ii) The disputed domain name is used to host a website featuring the Complainant's mark, logo as well as product photos and offering the Complainant's products for sale. The Respondent is passing off as the Complainant and giving Internet users the false and misleading impression that the site is controlled or at least authorized by the Complainant.

This clearly shows that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its mark, which constitutes bad faith use.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to file a Response and therefore failed to present any evidence of any good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain name prove that the disputed domain name was registered and is used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 <shopbiolongevitylabs.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: October 1, 2026