

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Eli Lilly and Company v. Master Casino, Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-4977

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Eli Lilly and Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Master Casino, Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <מיאמי.ומ> (<xn--6dbfb7al3c.com>) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 1, 2025. On December 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 2, 2025, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 2, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 3, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has partially redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescour gente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 December 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 25, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 6, 2025, expressing its willingness to cancel the disputed domain name. On December 8, 2025, the Center informed the Parties if they would like to explore settlement options, the Complainant should submit a request for suspension of the proceeding. The Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on January 5, 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 corporation organized under the laws of the State of Indiana, United States. According to the Complainant’s website under domain name <lilly.com>, the Complainant is a pharmaceutical company which produces pharmaceutical preparations for certain treatments.

The Complainant markets a medication for type 2 diabetes called “Mounjaro”. The Complainant provides details of this medication on its website under the domain name <mounjaro.lilly.com>. The Complainant also owns the domain name <mounjaro.com> which redirects to that website.

The Complainant owns an international portfolio of trademark registrations for MOUNJARO including United States Registration No. 6,809,369 that was entered on the register on August 2, 2022; and Israeli Registration No. 337325, which was applied for on March 11, 2021, and registered on October 3, 2022.

The Complainant’s third quarter financial report for 2025 announced that the product produced over USD 15.5 billion (USD 15,555,800,000) revenue in sales worldwide through the end of the third quarter.

According to the Registrar’s records, the Respondent has the surname “Casino”, and has an address said to be in Amsterdam, Israel. The Respondent uses a “.ru” ending email address.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 11, 2025.

The disputed domain name consists of the Hebrew letters “מונגרא” which has no meaning in Hebrew but which the Complainant asserts phonetically approximates to “Mongro.”

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website in Hebrew promoting the Complainant’s MOUNJARO branded product without the apparent need for prescription, and displaying photographs of what appears to be the Complainant’s branded product, and information about that product.

At the present time, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

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.

In summary, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name consists of a highly distinctive MOUNJARO mark, transliterated into Hebrew. The fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's highly distinctive mark in its entirety - merely transliterated into Hebrew - creates sufficient similarity to render the disputed domain name confusingly similar.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with a privacy-shielding service and has used the disputed domain name to direct Internet traffic to a website that sells the Complainant's product without a prescription outside the legitimate pharmaceutical supply chain through general messaging apps such as WhatsApp and Telegram, all without disclosing the Respondent's lack of a relationship with the Complainant.

The Respondent fails to accurately disclose its relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant.

The failure of the Respondent to accurately identify itself is further evidence of a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

Further, the Complainant claims that the company name displayed on the website at the disputed domain name does not exist. The Complainant further notes this is the same company name used on the previously active website at the domain name <mounjaro.co.il>, which the Complainant has addressed through a registrar block for the illegitimate activities occurring thereon.

There can be no doubt that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's mark, particularly considering that the Respondent is purporting to sell the Complainant's own goods (albeit without the apparent need for a prescription) under the disputed domain name which is comprised of the Complainant's transliterated mark. This is, in itself, indicative of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal response to the Complainant's contentions.

In an email communication to the Center dated December 6, 2025, the Respondent stated, in part: "I saw that there is a problem with the domain, even though it does not use the exact product name. In any case, we are not looking for trouble or problems and would indeed be happy to cancel the domain and delete it."

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

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

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.2.1.

A domain name that consists or is comprised of a translation or transliteration of a trademark will normally be found to be identical or confusingly similar to such trademark for purposes of standing under the Policy, where the trademark – or its variant – is incorporated into or otherwise recognizable, through such translation/transliteration, in the domain name. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.14. See for example *The Coca-Cola Company v. Keren, Chen*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1852](#).

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name consists of the highly distinctive MOUNJARO mark, transliterated into Hebrew. The Complainant also asserts that the disputed domain name is phonetically approximate to "Mongro". The transliteration of the Complainant's exact mark (MOUNJARO - which is pronounced as /mun-jar-o/ or /moon-jaro/) is pronounced "mon-gar-o" or "mon-jaro", which is visually and aurally equivalent to the Complainant's mark. Both terms share the same sequence of sounds - "Mon" or "Mun," followed by "jaro" or "gro" - making them confusingly similar to an average consumer familiar with either English or Hebrew. This is not disputed by the Respondent.

The content of the website associated with the domain name is usually disregarded by panels when assessing confusing similarity under the first element. In some instances, panels have however taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears *prima facie* that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.15.

Moreover, in certain circumstances, it is permissible for the panel to consider the website at the disputed domain name to gain an indication of the intended meaning of the disputed domain name. See *Zippo Manufacturing Company v. Domains by Proxy, LLC and Paul Campanella*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0995](#), cited with approval in *VF Corporation v. Vogt Debra*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2650](#); and *Gravity Co., LTD. and Gravity Interactive, Inc. v. Domain Privacy Service FBO Registrant / Junior Silva*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2648](#); *Fenix International Limited v. Nemanja Krecelj / Nemanja Krecelj, Rocket Science Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2667](#); and *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC / yossri ben salah, to leaks*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0872](#).

Here, the website at the disputed domain name confirms confusing similarity since it appears *prima facie* that the Respondent sought to target the Complainant's trademark through the disputed domain name.

The Panel thus finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

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 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 3.0](#), 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 Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark (usually) owned by the complainant.

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 Complainant's MOUNJARO branded product has been a blockbuster success.

In the present case, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name which is similar to the Complainant's MOUNJARO mark (transliterated in Hebrew) in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant. Clearly, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, and selected the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the Complainant and its MOUNJARO mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 fact that the disputed domain name does not presently resolve to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

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 <מוניארו.ком> (<xn--6dbfb7al3c.com>) be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026