ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
TruHlth Holdings Inc. v. Niles Kings
Case No. D2026-3955

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 Niles Kings, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <biolongevitylabs.online> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 3, 2026. On September 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 4, 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/Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 8, 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 September 11, 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 September 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on October 12, 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 company incorporated in Ohio, United States, that does business as Biolongevity Labs (Annex A to the Complaint). The Complainant states that it has used the name and mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS in the United States since at least as early as November 2024 and that it owns and operates the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com>. The Complainant's website, as captured on August 19, 2025, and May 27, 2026, displays the name BIOLONGEVITY LABS with a logo consisting of a double helix design within a square, and offers research peptides, bioregulators, and supplements for sale (Annex A to the Complaint).

The Complainant owns the following registrations for the word mark BIOLONGEVITY LABS (the "Mark"), each covering goods in International Classes 1 and 5, including peptide substrates, reagents, and polypeptides for research use, and nutraceuticals and nutritional supplements consisting primarily of peptides and bioregulators: United Kingdom registration No. UK00004304135, filed on December 2, 2025, claiming priority of August 19, 2025, and entered in the register on February 27, 2026; and European Union trademark registration No. 019286841, filed on December 4, 2025, and registered on April 26, 2026. The Complainant also owns United States registration No. 8450862, for its logo , filed on May 27, 2026 and registered on September 22, 2026.[1]

The Complainant also owns a pending application in the United States for the Mark, Serial No. 99344809, filed on August 19, 2025, claiming first use in commerce at least as early as November 2024.

The disputed domain name <biolongevitylabs.online> was registered on June 3, 2026 (Annex B to the Complaint). On November 1, 2026, the Panel found that the disputed domain name <biolongevitylabs.online> resolves to an English-language website that displays the name "BioLongevity Labs" and a logo corresponding to the logo on the Complainant's website (Annex A to the Complaint). The website has navigation links for "Peptides", "Bioregulators", "About Us", and "Resources", which correspond to those on the Complainant's website, and for "Contact Us". The website describes itself as a chemical supplier of research peptides and bioregulators and states its catalog spans more than 150 compounds with prices in dollars and a shopping cart, including Epithalon and Cartalax, which also appear on the Complainant's website. It states that its products are for research use only. The website identifies no legal entity or physical address and gives an email address at the disputed domain name <biolongevitylabs.online> as its contact. Its privacy policy states that it was last revised on June 1, 2026, and elsewhere on the same page shows a last revised date of March 22, 2024, states that the operator is based in the United States, and gives the mailing address as "[Address], United States".

---

[1] The Complaint and Annex A describe these marks as applications. The Panel consulted the public records of the European Union Intellectual Property Office, the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office, and the United States Patent and Trademark Office on November 1, 2026,, which show that both marks were registered before the Complaint was filed and that the United States logo registration issued on September 22, 2026. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.8.

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.

The Complainant contends that it owns trademark rights in BIOLONGEVITY LABS in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union, and that it has used the mark for goods in International Classes 1 and 5 since at least as early as November 2024. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the Mark apart from the ".online" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), and that the Respondent merely replaced the ".com" of the Complainant's domain name <biolongevitylabs.com> with ".online".

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it, and has no noncommercial, fair use, or other legitimate rights. The Complainant contends that the Respondent can operate under a domain name that does not incorporate the Mark, and that the disputed domain name serves only to divert business and capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant had established its rights and registered the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com>, primarily to disrupt the Complainant's business. The Complainant contends that the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark, within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and that the Respondent used the Mark and the Complainant's copyrighted artwork on its website to mislead consumers and divert traffic.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant owns registrations for the Mark in the United Kingdom and the European Union, which predate the filing of the Complaint. Registered trademarks establish rights under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Respondent appears to be located in the United States, and the Complainant's registrations for the denomination BIOLONGEVITY LABS are not United States registrations. Nevertheless, the jurisdiction in which a mark is valid is not relevant to the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.1.2.[2]

The standing test for confusing similarity is a side-by-side comparison of the disputed domain name and the Mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. The gTLD ".online" is disregarded under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1. Disregarding the gTLD and the space in the Mark, the disputed domain name is identical to the Mark. The Panel finds the disputed domain name is identical to the Mark for purposes of the UDRP.

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

---

[2] The Panel does not rely on the Complainant's pending applications in the United States, which would not by themselves establish rights. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.1.4.

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.

Nothing in the record indicates that the Complainant authorized the Respondent to use the Mark, and the Respondent has not contended otherwise. The Registrar identified the registrant as Niles Kings, which does not correspond to the disputed domain name. The Respondent used the disputed domain name <biolongevitylabs.online> for a website that presents itself under the Complainant's name, displays a logo corresponding to the Complainant's logo, and offers the same categories of products as the Complainant for sale, without disclosing any relationship to the Complainant. That use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Furthermore, a domain name identical to a complainant's trademark carries a high risk of implied affiliation. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here 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 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 used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark, within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The Complainant registered the Mark in the United Kingdom on February 27, 2026, and in the European Union on April 26, 2026, and had operated a website under the Mark at the domain name <biolongevitylabs.com> since at least August 2025. The Complainant filed its United States application for its logo on May 27, 2026, seven days before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 3, 2026. The disputed domain name is identical to the Mark.

The Complainant operates in the United States, and the Respondent's website presents itself as a United States business selling the same category of products under the same name and logo as the Complainant. The Respondent's reproduction of the Complainant's name, logo, and product offering indicates that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its business when it registered the disputed domain name, irrespective of where the Complainant obtained its registrations. The Respondent's privacy policy bears revision dates that precede the registration of the disputed domain name and gives a placeholder in place of a mailing address, and the website identifies no legal entity or physical address. The Respondent has not come forward with any explanation. The Panel finds that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's Mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant. The website at the disputed domain name <biolongevitylabs.online> displays the Complainant's name and a logo corresponding to the Complainant's logo, and offers research peptides and bioregulators, including compounds that also appear on the Complainant's website, for sale with prices and a shopping cart. The website presents itself under the Complainant's name without disclosing any relationship to the Complainant, and its content is likely to lead Internet users to believe that it originates with, or is affiliated with, the Complainant. That use falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation and passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy, and 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 <biolongevitylabs.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/
William F. Hamilton
Sole Panelist
Date: November 1, 2026