ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Eli Lilly and Company v. Candie Deloach, Excella, Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co., Albert Smith
Case No. D2026-0843

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Candie Deloach, Excella, US; Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co., China; and Albert Smith, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <mounaro.com>, <mounharo.com>, <mouunjaro.com>, <mounjao.com>, <mounjsro.com>, <mounnjaro.com>, <moubjaro.com>, <moounjaro.com>, <nounjaro.com>, <mounjjaro.com>, <mounjrao.com>, <moinjaro.com>, <mounjouro.com>, <miunjaro.com>, <mpunjaro.com>, <mlunjaro.com>, <moujnaro.com>, <m0unjaro.com>, and <mounajro.com> are registered with Cosmotown, Inc.; the disputed domain name <monjarou.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC; and the disputed domain names <mmounjaro.com>, <mounjaor.com>, <mounjaeo.com>, and <mounjaroo.com> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 26, 2026. On February 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 27, 2026, and March 2, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (HE, CN, et al.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 3, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 4, 2026.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant March 3, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed the amendments to the Complaint on March 4, and March 9, 2026, respectively.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendments to 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 30, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on April 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Tommaso La Scala as the sole panelist in this matter on April 13, 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 in this administrative proceeding is a renowned US pharmaceutical company established in 1876 and operating worldwide, inter alia, under the MOUNJARO trademark, registered since 2019 to denote a pharmaceutical preparation for the treatment of diabetes, which is very popular at national and international level.

The Complainant owns several international and national trademarks for MOUNJARO, including – as a mere example – the US registration No. 6,809,369, granted on August 2, 2022 in class 5 and the European Union Trademark registration No. 018209187 granted on September 8, 2020 in class 5. The Complainant also owns many domain names comprehensive of the MOUNJARO trademark, such as <mounjaro.com>, registered in 2019, which redirects to the website at the domain name <mounjaro.lilly.com> for providing information regarding the MOUNJARO products.

The disputed domain names were registered between October 31, 2023 and November 30, 2025 and they have been used to redirect to the same third party website prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark MOUNJARO, mimicking the colour scheme, look and feel of the Complainant's official website. The website has been used – among others – to sell pharmaceutical products purportedly manufactured by the Complainant, but also by the Complainant's competitors.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(a) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks;

(b) the Respondents lack any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and

(c) the Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith, namely for impersonating the Complainant in order to mislead Internet users for undue commercial purposes.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amendment to the Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel first notes that the disputed domain names redirect toward the same third party website, while two of the Respondents even share the same email address. Furthermore, several disputed domain names registered by different Respondents were registered on the same day, and all Respondents have been involved in a previous UDRP case (*Novo Nordisk A/S v. Candie Deloach / Excella / Albert Smith / quanzhongjun*, NAF Claim No. FA 2511002189565) in which the panel granted the complainant's consolidation request of multiple registrants. It is also undeniable that the disputed domain names all incorporate misspelled versions of the Complainant's registered MOUNJARO trademark, with the same generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension.

The Respondents have not opposed the Complainant's request for consolidation.

Therefore, the Panel considers that the disputed domain names are likely to be owned by the same Respondent with different aliases and are subject to common control. As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has established rights in the MOUNJARO trademark.

The Panel finds that all disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The MOUNJARO mark is recognizable in each of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names are each a deliberate and transparent

variation of the MOUNJARO mark, differing from it only by minor and inconsequential alterations, including the omission of a letter (e.g., <mounaro.com>, <mounjao.com>), the substitution of one letter for another (e.g., <mounjaeo.com>, <moinjaro.com>, <miunjaro.com>, <mpunjaro.com>, <mlunjaro.com>, <m0unjaro.com>, <mounjsro.com>, <mounharo.com>, <moubjaro.com>, and <nounjaro.com>), the doubling of a letter (e.g., <mouunjaro.com>, <moounjaro.com>, <mounnjaro.com>, <mounjjaro.com>, <mmounjaro.com>, and <mounjaroo.com>), the transposition of adjacent letters (e.g., <mounjrao.com>, <mounajro.com>, <moujnaro.com>, and <mounjaor.com>), or the insertion of a superfluous vowel (e.g., <mounjouro.com>) or the omission of a letter and the addition of a letter in the end (e.g., <monjarou.com>).

These variations are classic examples of typosquatting, and the addition of the gTLD domain suffix ".com" does not diminish the confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the MOUNJARO mark. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the requirement of confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied with respect to all 24 disputed domain names.

Therefore, the Panel finds the disputed domain names to be confusingly similar to the MOUNJARO trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, 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 3.1, section 2.1.

This Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. As a matter of fact, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name "Mounjaro" or any similar name or the disputed domain names. The Respondent has no connection to or affiliation with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent does not appear to make any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, nor any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Lastly, the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to purportedly sell pharmaceutical products manufactured by the Complainant and its competitors. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of this case.

Having reviewed the available record and considering that 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 names 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

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 Complainant has documented that the Respondent has purposely registered and used the disputed domain names to attempt to defraud others by passing it off as the Complainant's official website or the Complainant's authorized channel. This conduct is, in the Panel's view, sufficient to show that the Respondent not only knew of the Complainant and its trademarks but intentionally intended to divert Internet users, for its own commercial gain. Moreover, the fact that the Respondent is using the Complainant's mark to drive Internet traffic to its websites to purportedly also sell products manufactured by the Complainant's competitors is further evidence of bad faith.

In addition, the Respondent has been involved in at least a prior UDRP proceeding which demonstrates a pattern of bad faith conduct.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names constitutes a disruption of the Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use 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 names <m0unjaro.com>, <miunjaro.com>, <mlunjaro.com>, <mmounjaro.com>, <moinjaro.com>, <monjarou.com>, <moounjaro.com>, <moubjaro.com>, <moujnaro.com>, <mounajro.com>, <mounaro.com>, <mounharo.com>, <mounjaeo.com>, <mounjao.com>, <mounjaor.com>, <mounjaroo.com>, <mounjjaro.com>, <mounjouro.com>, <mounjrao.com>, <mounjsro.com>, <mounnjaro.com>, <mouunjaro.com>, <mpunjaro.com>, and <nounjaro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tommaso La Scala/
Tommaso La Scala
Sole Panelist
Date: April 27, 2026