ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Eli Lilly and Company v. caleb thompson
Case No. D2026-0914

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is caleb thompson, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mounjaroweightloss-uk.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 3, 2026. On March 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 5, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 5, 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 9, 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 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Halvor Manshaus as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 United States-based pharmaceutical company headquartered in Indiana offering pharmaceutical preparations for the treatment of type 2 diabetes under the trademark MOUNJARO.

The Complainant received approval from the United States Food and Drug Administration for the product marketed under the MOUNJARO mark in May 2022 and has since obtained regulatory approvals for distribution in various formats in several jurisdictions worldwide, including the United Kingdom. The product marketed under the MOUNJARO mark was launched in June 2022, generating nearly USD 280 million in revenue in its launch year. The Complainant has since generated increasing revenues from the product, including over USD 22.96 billion worldwide during the 2025 fiscal year.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations comprising MOUNJARO in several jurisdictions around the world, including:

- The United States trademark number 6,809,369 for class 5, registered on August 2, 2022;
- The United Kingdom registration number UK00003608193 for class 5, registered on July 16, 2021;
- The Hong Kong, China registration number 305559247 for class 5, registered on March 11, 2021; and
- The New Zealand registration number 1143992 for class 5, deemed date of registration of November 5, 2019.

The Complainant also holds the domain name <mounjaro.com>, registered on October 21, 2019, which redirects to the website at the domain name <mounjaro.lilly.com>, where the Complainant advertises and provides information regarding its MOUNJARO product.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 31, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website operating under the name “MOUNJARO WEIGHTLOSS UK”, where goods appearing to be counterfeit or unauthorized versions of the Complainant’s MOUNJARO product are offered without requiring a prescription and in jurisdictions where the MOUNJARO product is not approved for distribution. The website further displays the Complainant’s official marketing images of the MOUNJARO product. Moreover, third-party pharmaceutical products such as Orlistat, Saxenda, Wegovy, and Xenical competing with the Complainant’s MOUNJARO product are also offered on the website. The website further provides information on the use and administration of pharmaceutical products and offers online consultation and purchasing options.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the MOUNJARO mark in its entirety, together with the addition of the generic term “weightloss” and the geographic term “uk”, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, the addition of the geographic term “uk” may enhance confusion, as Internet users could assume the disputed domain name is the Complainant’s official United Kingdom website.

Additionally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized to use the MOUNJARO mark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Instead, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website impersonating an official source of the Complainant, offering what appears to be counterfeit or unauthorized (gray market) versions of the Complainant's pharmaceutical product without requiring valid prescriptions, including in jurisdictions where such product is not approved.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that its trademark is widely known and that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name, particularly as the disputed domain name is used to offer apparently counterfeit or unauthorized MOUNJARO products. Further, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is used to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, including through the unauthorized use of the Complainant's copyright-protected marketing images. The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering apparently counterfeit or unauthorized products, as well as competing products, and falsely suggests an association with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to offer prescription drugs without requiring prescriptions, including in jurisdictions where the drugs have not been approved, constitutes bad faith registration and use. The Complainant also asserts that such conduct poses risks to public health, which further supports a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "weightloss" and "uk", 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 name 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 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Further, the Panel notes that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website offering apparently counterfeit or unauthorized versions of the Complainant's products and competing products, also appearing to facilitate sales in jurisdictions where the Complainant's products are not authorized.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as sale of counterfeit goods or (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals, 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 disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and that the Complainant's trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name, particularly given that the Respondent purports to sell apparently counterfeit or unauthorized versions of the Complainant's products under the disputed domain name.

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 Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The website features the Complainant's trademark and copyright-protected marketing images and purports to offer apparently counterfeit or unauthorized versions of the Complainant's products alongside competing products.

Further, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is used to offer apparently unauthorized or counterfeit pharmaceutical products without requiring valid prescriptions, including in jurisdictions where the Complainant's products are not approved for distribution.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as sale of counterfeit goods or (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. 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 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 <mounjaroweightloss-uk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Halvor Manshaus/
Halvor Manshaus
Sole Panelist
Date: April 29, 2026