

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Eli Lilly and Company v. Fatima Zahra; Muhammad Junaid; Lafont Alain, Freelancer; Muhammad Qasim, 16301594; Felipe Souza, Job; Danson Wong; Dimas Septiana; Ramazan Can; set2025 mojaró; Domain Support, LeadConnector LLC; Pharma Medical, Pharma Medical; DMCA NIC, DMCA; Ghulam Mustafa, dmcnic.com; Melo Shaddy, Freelancer; George Essembe; Laiba Latif; Muchammad Arif; and Possibility Official
Case No. D2026-0846

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 Respondents are Fatima Zahra, Pakistan; Muhammad Junaid, United Arab Emirates; Lafont Alain, Freelancer, Germany; Muhammad Qasim, 16301594, United Kingdom; Felipe Souza, Job, Brazil; Danson Wong, Malaysia; Dimas Septiana, Germany; Ramazan Can, Türkiye; set2025 mojaró, Nigeria; Domain Support, LeadConnector LLC, United States; Pharma Medical, Pharma Medical, Pakistan; DMCA NIC, DMCA, United Kingdom; Ghulam Mustafa, dmcnic.com, Pakistan; Melo Shaddy, Freelancer, Germany; George Essembe, Cameroon; Laiba Latif, Pakistan; Muchammad Arif, Indonesia; and Possibility Official, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <buymounjaroaustralia.org>, <buymounjarodubai.org>, <mounjaroidubai.com>, <mounjaroidubai.org>, <mounjaroineurope.com>, <mounjaroisrael.org>, <mounjaroitaly.org>, <mounjarokuwaitpharmacy.org>, <mounjaroqatar.com>, <mounjarosouthafrica.org>, and <mounjarobuyonlineegypt.org> are registered with CloudFlare, Inc. The disputed domain name <malaysiamounjaro.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc. The disputed domain names <mounjaroapotek.com> and <mounjaroapotek.shop> are registered with Dynadot Inc. The disputed domain name <mounjaroaustraliashop.com> is registered with eNom, LLC. The disputed domain names <mounjarobuyonlineusa.org> and <mounjaronewzealand.org> are registered with Hosting Ukraine LLC (ua.ukraine). The disputed domain names <mounjaroidonesia.com> and <mounjarowelghtloss.com> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB. The disputed domain names <mounjaro-tirzepatida.com>, <mounjaroinpakistan.com> and <mounjarowebiste.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. The disputed domain name <mounjaromalaysian.com> is registered with Hosting

Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. The disputed domain name <mounjaroturkey.com> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the “Registrars”). All the disputed domain names shall be collectively referred to as the “Disputed Domain Names”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English 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. Between February 27 and March 6, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (punjab, PK, et al.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 12, 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/or that all Disputed Domain Names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on March 16, 2026.

On March 12, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the Disputed Domain Names <mounjarobuyonlineusa.org> and <mounjaronewzealand.org> is Russian. On March 16, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 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 in English and Russian of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 8, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on April 20, 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 leading global pharmaceutical company based in Indianapolis, United States.

The Complainant launched its MOUNJARO branded product in June 2022 after the United States Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) announced its approval of the medication Tirzepatide under the brand name MOUNJARO for use in connection with injectable pharmaceutical products for the treatment of type 2 diabetes on May 13, 2022. Sales of MOUNJARO branded products continued to dramatically increase since its launch in 2022 from nearly USD 280 million in revenue up to USD 22 billion at the end of 2025 fiscal year. MOUNJARO branded product is a prescription-only injectable medication.

At the time of filing the Complaint, governing national bodies similar to the FDA have approved MOUNJARO for distribution in many other countries, such as: the United Kingdom, Brazil, the United Arab Emirates, Germany, Malaysia, Türkiye, Indonesia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Hong Kong, China, Hungary, India, and Qatar.

The Complainant owns at least 143 trademark registrations in 91 jurisdictions for or including MOUNJARO (or its foreign language equivalents), such as the following:

- the United States Trademark Registration number 6809369 for MOUNJARO (word), filed on November 5, 2019, registered on August 2, 2022, covering goods in International Class 5;
- the European Union Trade Mark registration number 018209187 for MOUNJARO (word), filed on March 11, 2020, registered on September 8, 2020, covering goods in International Class 5; and
- the United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00003608193 for MOUNJARO (word), filed on March 11, 2011, registered on July 16, 2021, covering goods in International Class 5.

The Complainant also holds at least 24 registrations in 22 jurisdictions for the MOUNJARO logo, for example the European Union figurative Trade Mark registration number 018531486, filed on August 11, 2021, registered on February 2, 2022, covering goods and services in International Classes 5 and 44.

The Complainant holds domain names incorporating its MOUNJARO mark, such as <mounjaro.com>, registered on October 21, 2019, which redirects to <mounjaro.lilly.com>.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered as follows:

- <mounjarosouthafrica.org>, was registered on February 8, 2025;
- <mounjaroturkey.com>, was registered on March 2, 2025;
- <mounjaroundubai.org>, was registered on May 5, 2025;
- <mounjaroinpakistan.com>, was registered on May 12, 2025;
- <mounjaroisrael.org>, was registered on June 16, 2025;
- <mounjarowebiste.com>, was registered on June 18, 2025;
- <mounjaroqatar.com>, and <mounjarokuwaitpharmacy.org>, were registered on July 25, 2025;
- <buymounjarodubai.org> was registered on August 13, 2025;
- <mounjaroaustraliashop.com>, was registered on August 19, 2025;
- <mounjarowelghtloss.com>, was registered on August 29, 2025;
- <mounjaroapotek.shop>, was registered on September 24, 2025;
- <mounjaroitaly.org>, <mounjarobuyonlineegypt.org>, and <mounjaroineurope.com>, were registered on October 4, 2025;
- <mounjaroidonesia.com>, was registered on October 11, 2025;
- <mounjaronewzealand.org>, and <mounjarobuyonlineusa.org>, were registered on October 24, 2025;
- <mounjaroundubai.com>, was registered on November 7, 2025;
- <buymounjaroaustralia.org>, was registered on November 25, 2025;
- <malaysiamounjaro.com>, was registered on December 9, 2025;
- <mounjaroapotek.com>, was registered on December 16, 2025;
- <mounjaromalaysian.com>, was registered on December 20, 2025; and
- <mounjaro-tirzepatida.com>, was registered on January 12, 2026.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, all the Disputed Domain Names resolved to websites purporting to offer MOUNJARO branded products, even in jurisdictions where the Complainant's products were not yet approved for distribution, such as Pakistan. Also, all the websites under the Disputed Domain Names display the MOUNJARO trademark and logo, as well as official marketing images of the MOUNJARO auto-injector pens and do not contain a disclaimer to accurately disclose the relationship with the Complainant.

Further, the websites associated with the Disputed Domain Names either explicitly state that they allow users to buy MOUNJARO product without a prescription and/or allow users to proceed through the checkout process without providing proof of a prescription.

Some of the Disputed Domain Names, such as <mounjaromalaysian.com>, are also offering for sale competing third-party products.

Some of the Respondents were involved in past UDRP disputes decided against them.

For example the Respondent Pharma Medical, Pharma Medical was the registrant of domain names that were the subject of previous UDRP cases *Eli Lilly and Company v. Syed Shehryar Sarwar, XMart Host LTD, Hoster Ocean, Christopher Jack, Individual, Waqas Raza, NextGenSol LLC, Pharma Medical, Pharma Medical, and Pharma Medical, Pharma Medical*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0025](#); and *Eli Lilly and Company v. Ghulam Mustafa, dmcnic.com, Hussnain Raza Sheikh, Hosting PK, Pharma Medical, Pharma Medical, and Joony Smith*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3168](#).

Similarly, the Respondent Ghulam Mustafa, dmcnic.com was the registrant of domain names that were the subject of at least two prior UDRP cases. See *Eli Lilly and Company v. Hussnain Raza Sheikh, Hosting PK; Ghulam Mustafa, dmcnic.com; Pharma Medical, Pharma Medical; and Joony Smith*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1505](#); and *Eli Lilly and Company v. Ghulam Mustafa, dmcnic.com, Hussnain Raza Sheikh, Hosting PK, Pharma Medical, Pharma Medical, and Joony Smith*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3168](#).

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:

- the MOUNJARO trademark is highly distinctive and well-known internationally;
- the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to its trademark since they incorporate the Complainant's trademark alongside geographic and/or generic terms and it is well-settled that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity;
- the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names: the Respondents do not have the Complainant's permission, authorization, consent, or license to use the MOUNJARO mark; there is no evidence that the Respondents are commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names. Instead the Respondents: (i) have registered the Disputed Domain Names with privacy-shielding services to impersonate the Complainant and direct Internet traffic to websites that sell either counterfeit or gray market versions of the Complainant's products in jurisdictions in which the product has not been legally approved for distribution; (ii) use some of the Disputed Domain Names (such as <mounjaromalaysian.com>) to offer for sale competing third-party products; (iii) allow users to buy MOUNJARO branded product without a prescription and/or allow users to proceed through the checkout process without providing proof of a prescription; (iv) fail to accurately disclose their relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant and the lack of any such statement or disclaimer, together with the incorporation of the Complainant's mark in the Disputed Domain Names and on the websites under the Disputed Domain Names is likely to create confusion as to whether the Disputed Domain Names are the Complainant's official websites for providing MOUNJARO product; and (v) on websites associated with several Disputed Domain Names, offered MOUNJARO via WhatsApp, a communications channel which is not designed for sensitive medical information or prescription purchases;

- the Respondents registered and are using the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith mainly because: (i) the Complainant's first trademark application in the United States was on November 5, 2019, well before the registration of the Disputed Domain Names; (ii) the Complainant has extensively marketed its MOUNJARO brand product in the United States and other jurisdictions around the world and therefore the MOUNJARO trademark is widely recognized; (iii) the Respondents are using the Complainant's mark to drive Internet traffic to the websites under the Disputed Domain Names to profit from the sale of gray market or otherwise counterfeit products, all while concealing their identity; (iv) the content of the websites associated with the Disputed Domain Names, such as the use of the Complainant's mark, copyright-protected images, and offers to buy MOUNJARO branded products, misleads Internet users into believing that there is an association between the Complainant and such websites, and serves as further evidence of an intentional attempt to attract Internet users to the Disputed Domain Names for commercial gain in bad faith by creating a likelihood of confusion with the MOUNJARO mark; (v) the Respondents have acted in bad faith and registered domain names containing the Complainant's mark, thus preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain names. Some of the Respondents were involved in past UDRP disputes decided against them; (vi) the Respondents are using the Disputed Domain Names to offer prescription-only products without any apparent requirement for a prescription or in jurisdictions where prescriptions are otherwise not yet available; and (vii) the registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a registered trademark by an entity that has no relationship to the mark is sufficient evidence to demonstrate opportunistic bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different Disputed Domain Name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the Disputed Domain Name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes 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 notes that the Disputed Domain Names (i) were created in a similar manner: fully incorporating the trademark MOUNJARO with additional terms either geographic, or generic, or a combination thereof (one with a minor misspelling); (ii) are used in a similar manner, all promoting MOUNJARO branded products, displaying the Complainant's mark, logo and product images, use similar headers/footers and advertisement text; (iii) were registered within a period of almost one year, some on the same day or at short intervals between them; (iv) were registered using privacy services; and (v) the Respondents have not objected to the consolidation claims made by the Complainant despite the communications sent by the Center to them.

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.

B. Language of Proceeding

The language of the registration agreement for the Disputed Domain Names <mounjarobuyonlineusa.org> and <mounjaronewzealand.org> is Russian.

The Complainant has asked the language of proceeding be English.

Under paragraph 11 of the Rules, the language of the proceedings is the language of the registration agreement of the disputed domain name, unless both parties agree otherwise, or the panel determines otherwise based on one party's request. The panel decides that proceedings should be conducted in another language generally when it is necessary due to different nationalities of the parties and when the complainant does not understand the language of the registration agreement and it would therefore be unfairly disadvantaged by the fact that it must translate all the documents involved in such proceeding but it must also submit evidence that the respondent understands the language requested by the complainant.

In the present case, the websites under the Disputed Domain Names <mounjarobuyonlineusa.org> and <mounjaronewzealand.org> are in English, the Center communicated the case file documents in both English and Russian, the Panel found that all the Disputed Domain Names are under common control, and the Respondent did not submit any comment to the language request made by the Complainant.

For all the above, the Panel decides that English is the language of the proceedings for all the Disputed Domain Names.

6.2. Substantive Issue: Three Elements

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Names are 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 the Disputed Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 mark MOUNJARO is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, each of the Disputed Domain Names is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here geographic terms, such as “australia”, “dubai”, “malaysia”, “malaysian”, “egypt”, “usa”, “indonesia”, “europa”, “pakistan”, “israel”, “italy”, “kuwait”, “new zealand”, “qatar”, “south africa”, “turkey”; dictionary terms, such as “in”, “buy”, “online”, “pharmacy”, “website”, “shop”, “tirzepatida”, “apotek” (“pharmacy” in Norwegian), and/or combinations thereof, or misspellings such as

“weightloss” (from “weight loss”), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

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 Names. 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.

According to the evidence, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Names in connection with websites promoting and offering for sale goods identical to those of the Complainant, some with significant price reductions, without complying with the relevant regulations (such as prescription and taking account of the jurisdictions where the product is legally approved for distribution), displaying the Complainant’s trademark, logo, similar product images, without providing any accurate or prominent disclaimer, and/or also offering for sale third parties’ goods. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (as claimed here sale of counterfeit goods or (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel further notes that the Disputed Domain Names, reproducing the Complainant’s mark MOUNJARO with additional geographic terms (i.e. “dubai”, “malaysia”, “egypt”, “usa”, “europe”, “pakistan”, “israel”, “italy”, “south africa”, “turkey”, etc), and/or dictionary terms generally used in the Complainant’s industry (i.e. “buy”, “online”, “pharmacy”, “website”, “shop”, “tirzepatida” which is the active ingredient in the Complainant’s MOUNJARO branded product), carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Therefore, such composition cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 Disputed Domain Names were registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant, its trademark and products, particularly because the Disputed Domain Names incorporate the Complainant’s trademark plus a geographic term and/or dictionary terms related to the Complainant’s area of commercial activity, the registration of the trademark predates the registration of

the Disputed Domain Names by almost 5 years and MOUNJARO mark is highly distinctive and well-known worldwide in the relevant industry. Furthermore, the use of the Disputed Domain Names corroborates this finding.

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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Given that the Disputed Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's well-known trademark and the websites operated under the Disputed Domain Names display the Complainant's trademark, logo, official marketing images, providing very likely unlicensed versions of the Complainant's products, and have no disclaimer to clarify the relationship between the Parties, indeed in this Panel's view, the Respondent intended to attract Internet users accessing the website corresponding to the Disputed Domain Names who may be confused and believe that they are websites held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated or related to the Complainant, for its commercial gain. This activity may also disrupt the Complainant's business, tarnish its trademark, and may put the safety of patients at risk.

In addition, paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy lists the situation when the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct. Here, the Respondent registered 24 Disputed Domain Names, subject to the present procedure, and has been involved in several UDRP cases as mentioned in Section 4 above. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

Previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith for the purpose of Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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 Names, <buymounjaroaustralia.org>, <buymounjarodubai.org>, <malaysiamounjaro.com>, <mounjaroapotek.com>, <mounjaroapotek.shop>, <mounjaroaustraliashop.com>, <mounjarobuyonlineegypt.org>, <mounjarobuyonlineusa.org>, <mounjaroindonesia.com>, <mounjaroindubai.com>, <mounjaroindubai.org>, <mounjaroineurope.com>, <mounjaroinpakistan.com>, <mounjaroisrael.org>, <mounjaroitaly.org>, <mounjarokuwaitpharmacy.org>, <mounjaromalaysian.com>, <mounjaronewzealand.org>, <mounjaroqatar.com>, <mounjarosouthafrica.org>, <mounjaro-tirzepatida.com>, <mounjaroturkey.com>, <mounjarowebbsite.com>, and <mounjarowelghtloss.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: May 4, 2026