

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Eli Lilly and Company v. ahmet total  
Case No. D2026-0849

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is ahmet total, Türkiye.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <iran-mounjaro.online> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **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 Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name.

On February 27, 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 (Registration Private DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 3, 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 March 3, 2026.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Erica Aoki as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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, Eli Lilly and Company, is a pharmaceutical company that developed and markets MOUNJARO (tirzepatide), a groundbreaking dual GIP and GLP-1 receptor agonist approved by the FDA in May 2022 for the treatment of type 2 diabetes and later for chronic weight management.

MOUNJARO is protected by numerous registered trademarks.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark rights in the trademark MOUNJARO, including:

– United States Trademark Registration No. 6,809,369 for MOUNJARO, registered on August 2, 2022, in International Class 5, covering pharmaceutical preparations for the treatment of type 2 diabetes and obesity.

The MOUNJARO trademark has been used continuously and exclusively in connection with the Complainant's products and has acquired goodwill and recognition in the pharmaceutical industry.

The disputed domain name <iran-mounjaro.online> was registered on January 4, 2026.

According to the record, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark and logo while offering the MOUNJARO products for sale without prescription.

The website uses the Complainant's official imagery and branding and purports to operate as a "Mounjaro Clinic" with worldwide shipping.

The record further indicates that the Respondent initially used a privacy protection service. The Registrar verification later identified the underlying registrant through Domains By Proxy.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied all three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

First, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known MOUNJARO trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the MOUNJARO trademark in its entirety, together with the geographic term "iran". According to the Complainant, the addition of this term does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity and, on the contrary, reinforces the impression of an affiliation with the Complainant's pharmaceutical products.

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has never been authorized or licensed to use the MOUNJARO trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further argues that the composition of the disputed domain name creates a misleading impression of affiliation and does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the Complainant's longstanding and well-known MOUNJARO trademark, the Respondent must

have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to sell unauthorized pharmaceutical products while reproducing the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark and logo. According to the Complainant, such use creates a clear likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, and further supports a finding of bad faith. The Complainant additionally submits that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent the finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

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

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

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the MOUNJARO trademark through its registered trademark rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark in its entirety as its dominant element. The addition of the geographic term "iran" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Panels have consistently held that the addition of a term does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity where the complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".online" is disregarded for the purposes of this comparison ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

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 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.

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.

According to the record, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent, who has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and is neither authorized, licensed, nor been allowed to use the Complainant's trademark to register a domain name.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

The second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark is distinctive and has been used for years, with rights dating back well before the registration of the disputed domain name. In these circumstances, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, together with the geographic term "iran", which reinforces an apparent association with the Complainant's pharmaceutical products. The Panel further notes that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to operate a website that displays the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark and logo while offering unauthorized pharmaceutical products. Such use creates a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement and constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent's failure to submit a Response further reinforces the inference of bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 name <iran-mounjaro.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Erica Aoki/*

**Erica Aoki**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2026