

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Eli Lilly and Company v. Guilherme Silva, Yuri Moerbeck, Beñat Felipe, Google silva, Gabriel Saraiva, ASTRON CAPS LTDA, Rifas Digital, Daniela Seoane, Haka Humans, Wavytalk, Muriele Borges, Nk Gestao Digital, Vercel Whois, Vercel Inc.

Case No. D2026-0934

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 Guilherme Silva, Brazil, Yuri Moerbeck, Brazil, Beñat Felipe, Ireland, Google silva, Brazil, Gabriel Saraiva, ASTRON CAPS LTDA, Brazil, Rifas Digital, Brazil, Daniela Seoane, Brazil, Haka Humans, Wavytalk, Spain, Muriele Borges, Nk Gestao Digital, Brazil, and Vercel Whois, Vercel Inc., United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <anastasiacmounjaro.online> is registered with IONOS SE.

The disputed domain name <cheapmounjaro.app> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc.

The disputed domain name <mounjaronaturaloficial.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu.

The disputed domain names <monjaroo.shop>, <moujarodepobre.site>, <mounjarodepobreoficial.shop>, <mounjarodospobres.site>, <mounjaromaterno.shop>, <mounjaro21dias.fun>, and <receitadomounjaro.online> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 4, 2026. On March 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 5, 6, 11 and 14, 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 (LT, et al. / The RDAP server redacted the value, Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 16, 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 18, 2026, and second amendment to the Complaint on March 25, 2026.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 15, 2026. The Respondents Muriele Borges, Nk Gestao Digital and Daniela Seoane sent email communications to the Center on March 28 and 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on April 27, 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, with a principal place of business in Indianapolis, Indiana, United States. The Complainant is a provider of pharmaceutical preparations worldwide and is the owner of the MOUNJARO mark which is used in connection with pharmaceutical products for the treatment of type 2 diabetes. The Complainant’s official website in connection with said products is found at the domain name <mounjaro.com>, registered by the Complainant on October 21, 2019, and used since May 17, 2022. The Complaint notes that the Complainant’s said products have been approved by (among others) the respective authorities for all of those countries in respect of which the registrants of the disputed domain names have provided a contact address, namely, Brazil, Ireland, Spain, and the United States, adding and evidencing that the related United States Food and Drug Administration approval was announced on May 13, 2022. The Complainant also shows that its MOUNJARO mark has been subject to widespread media coverage following said approval and that sales under the said mark substantially and positively affected the Complainant’s financial position. It is reasonable to infer from all such evidence that the said mark is well-known.

The Complainant is the owner of a variety of registered trademarks in respect of the MOUNJARO mark, including, for example:

United States Registered Trademark Number 6809369 in respect of the word mark MOUNJARO, registered on August 2, 2022, in Class 5 (pharmaceutical preparations, etc.); and

Brazilian Registered Trademark Number 919475787 in respect of the word mark MOUNJARO, registered on November 24, 2020, in Class 5 (pharmaceutical preparations, etc.).¹

¹The Complainant does not appear to have provided a copy of the relevant certificate despite including details of the mark in the Complaint. The Panel verified the details of said mark directly at the online portal for the Brazilian National Institute of Industrial Property. The Panel considers this verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

The disputed domain names were each registered within a period of just over 24 weeks in 2025, namely, between May 26, 2025 and November 14, 2025. They have been used for a variety of websites, the common feature being that these reference the Complainant's MOUNJARO mark and promote third party pharmaceutical, pseudo-pharmaceutical, or allegedly natural products. Various aspects of these websites, technical configurations of the disputed domain names, certain graphic designs, and other details are shared among the disputed domain names as discussed below. For convenience, the Panel discusses the disputed domain names in order of their respective registration dates, as follows:

The disputed domain name <mounjarodepobreoficial.shop> was registered on May 26, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Brazil. It uses the nameservers ns2.dns-parking.com and ns1.dns-parking.com, matching others listed here. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled "Mounjaro de Pobre". A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: "Elimina hasta 10kg de grasa [...]", and contains a cup and leaves logo, matching others of the disputed domain names listed here. The said website likewise contains a circular design with surrounding leaves and a script-style typeface featuring the term "Mounjaro del Pobre" which also matches others of the disputed domain names listed here. The disputed domain name uses an email address provided by the Gmail system for its contact email address, matching others listed here. The wording "Elimina hasta 10kg de grasa [...]" approximately matches wording in the website associated with the disputed domain name <mounjaro21dias.fun> discussed further below.

The disputed domain name <receitadomounjaro.online> was registered on June 4, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Brazil. It uses the nameservers ns2.dns-parking.com and ns1.dns-parking.com, matching others listed here. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled "Salt & Ice Weight Loss Plan". A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: "4-Week Natural Protocol for GLP-1 Activation". The disputed domain name uses an email address provided by the Gmail system for its contact email address, matching others listed here.

The disputed domain name <anastasiacmounjaro.online> was registered on September 5, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Brazil. It uses the nameservers ns1125.ui-dns.de and ns1094.ui-dns.com (with two further similar nameservers, ns1073.ui-dns.biz and ns1082.ui-dns.org). These nameservers do not match any others of the disputed domain names. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled "Mounjaro de los Pobres Natural". A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: "Ultima Oportunidad / Mounjaro de los Pobres Natural". The said website contains a cup and leaves logo, matching others of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain name uses an email address provided by the Gmail system for its contact email address, also matching others listed here.

The disputed domain name <moujarodepobre.site> was registered on September 8, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Brazil. This registrant has an identical surname and first name initial to that of the registrant of the disputed domain name <anastasiacmounjaro.online> described immediately above. It uses the nameservers ns2.dns-parking.com and ns1.dns-parking.com, matching others listed here. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled "Mounjaro de Pobre – Diagnóstico", approximating the titles of other websites associated with the disputed domain names listed here. A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: "Elimine até 10kg de gordura [...]", closely matching others listed here, save for the apparent typographical error in the word "gordura". The said website contains a circular design with surrounding leaves and a script-style typeface featuring the term "Mounjaro de Pobre" matching others of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain name uses an email address provided by the Gmail system for its contact email address, matching others listed here.

The disputed domain name <cheapmounjaro.app> was registered on September 9, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in California, United States. It uses the nameservers ns1.vercel-dns.com and ns2.vercel-dns.com which do not match others of the disputed domain names listed here. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled "Cheap Mounjaro", which, although it references the Complainant's mark, does not directly match others of the disputed domain names. A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: "Discover the new Cheap Mounjaro to

burn up to 10kg of fat in 21 days” which text does not directly match others listed here, although the theme is similar. However, the said website does contain a version of the cup and leaves logo, thus matching others of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain name <mounjaronaturaloficial.com> was registered on September 13, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Brazil. It uses the nameservers ns1.dns-parking.com and ns2.dns-parking.com, effectively matching others listed here. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled “mounjaronaturaloficial.com”. A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: “Elimine até 10kg de gordura [...]” matching others listed here. The disputed domain name uses an email address provided by the Gmail system for its contact email address, also matching others of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain name <mounjarodospobres.site> was registered on September 23, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Spain. It uses the nameservers ns2.dns-parking.com and ns1.dns-parking.com, matching others listed here. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled “Quiz - Mounjaro dos Pobres”, matching (largely in translation) the title of the website associated with the disputed domain name <mounjaro21dias.fun> noted below. A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: “Elimine até 10kg de gordura [...]” matching others listed here. The said website contains a cup and leaves logo, along with a circular design with surrounding leaves and a script-style typeface featuring the term “Mounjaro dos Pobres”, similar to others of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain name <monjaroo.shop> was registered on October 10, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Ireland. It uses the nameservers cdns2.main-hosting.eu and cdns1.main-hosting.eu, which do not match others listed here. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled “Mounjaro de Pobre”, broadly similar to others listed here. A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: “Elimine até 10kg de gordura [...]” matching other websites associated with the disputed domain names listed here. The said website contains a cup and leaves logo, also matching others of the disputed domain names, together with the circular design with surrounding leaves and a script-style typeface featuring the term “Mounjaro de Pobre” likewise matching others of the disputed domain names. Finally, the disputed domain name also uses an email address provided by the Gmail system for its contact email address, matching others listed here.

The disputed domain name <mounjaromaterno.shop> was registered on October 22, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Brazil. It uses the nameservers ns2.dns-parking.com and ns1.dns-parking.com, matching others listed here. A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: “MÉTODO SECRETO PARA EMAGRECER RÁPIDO MESMO SE ESTIVER AMAMENTANDO / SECRET METHOD TO LOSE WEIGHT FAST EVEN IF YOU ARE BREASTFEEDING” which does not match others listed here. The disputed domain name uses an email address provided by the Gmail system for its contact email address, matching others listed here.

The disputed domain name <mounjaro21dias.fun> was registered on November 14, 2025, by a registrant listing an address in Brazil. It uses the nameservers ns2.dns-parking.com and ns1.dns-parking.com, matching others listed here. The website associated with the said disputed domain name is entitled “Quiz • Poor Man’s Mounjaro”, broadly matching the title of the website associated with the disputed domain name <mounjarodospobres.site> listed above. A corresponding screenshot produced by the Complainant contains the following text: “Elimina hsta [sic] 10kg de grasa [...]” approximately matching the wording in the website associated with the disputed domain name <mounjarodepobreoficial.shop>. Finally, the disputed domain name <mounjaro21dias.fun> uses an email address provided by the Gmail system for its contact email address, matching others listed here.

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.

As a preliminary matter, the Complainant includes a request in the Complaint to proceed against all of the disputed domain names in a single proceeding. The Complainant notes that it must establish that the disputed domain names are under common control on a preponderance of the evidence. The Complainant describes the time period within which the disputed domain names were registered and the common Registrar and nameservers for the majority of these. The Complainant focuses on the common composition of the disputed domain names featuring the MOUNJARO mark and other terms, focusing on third party products offered as "Poor Man's Mounjaro" in English and other languages, the presence of common or similar content, and the use of the same images and designs. The Complainant concludes that because the disputed domain names were registered (i) using privacy shield services, (ii) within six months of each other, (iii) with seven of the disputed domain names using the same Registrar and overlapping name servers, (iv) using the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark alongside descriptive terms, and (v) relying on common marketing plays targeting the Brazilian market, the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

The Complainant contends that its use and registration of the MOUNJARO trademark predates the Respondents' registration of the disputed domain names. The Complainant asserts that said trademark is distinctive, and, as found by previous panels under the Policy, is an invented term. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the said trademark, noting in particular that the addition of descriptive terms, and generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs"), do not obviate a finding of confusing similarity, and that the presence of the Complainant's distinctive trademark in its entirety creates sufficient similarity to render the disputed domain names confusingly similar thereto.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents are not using the disputed domain names for a legitimate business purpose or a bona fide offering of goods and services, are not commonly known thereby, are not authorized to use the Complainant's trademark, and are using the disputed domain names intentionally to infringe upon the Complainant's trademark rights by offering to sell unauthorized, competitive alternatives, frequently referencing "Mounjaro de Pobres" or variations thereof (translating as "Poor Man's Mounjaro"). The Complainant states that the disputed domain names fail to meet all the requirements of the "Ok! Data test" and furthermore are used for illegal activity by passing off infringing goods as those of the Complainant under reference to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant notes that its mark is widely recognized, as found by a previous panel under the Policy, and submits that there could be no doubt that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant's rights, particularly as the Respondents purport to offer alternative versions of the Complainant's products. The Complainant adds that the disputed domain names are using the Complainant's well-known trademark to attract Internet users to the Respondents' websites for commercial gain involving the offering of competitive products purporting to be "poor man's" alternatives.

The Complainant submits that the presence of the Complainant's mark in the content of the websites associated with the disputed domain names misleads users into believing that there is an association between the Complainant and said websites, serving as 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 Complainant's mark. The Complainant states that previous panels under the Policy have found that the registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a registered trademark by an entity with no relationship to the mark is sufficient evidence to demonstrate opportunistic bad faith.

The Complainant concludes that the Respondents' use of the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain names is potentially harmful to the health of many unsuspecting consumers who may purchase products advertised at the associated websites under the impression that they are dealing with the Complainant or an

authorised party, whereby they would believe that they would be receiving effective drugs approved by the various global health authorities when they are not, adding that the Complainant's MOUNJARO brand product is only available on a physician's prescription and is manufactured according to applicable laws and regulations.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondents Muriele Borges, Nk Gestao Digital and Daniela Seoane sent email communications to the Center on March 28 and 31, 2026, stating that they have not used the disputed domain names.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Consideration: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the 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 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 notes that all of the disputed domain names were registered within a period of just over 24 weeks in 2025, and that there are various common features among these including, for example, the technical configuration, choice of registrar, website content including title, text and graphics, website subject matter, domain name composition, and Respondent address location. Each of the disputed domain names, taken individually, may be linked into the whole body of disputed domain names by way of various examples of these common features, as will be evident from consideration of their respective descriptions in the factual background section above. The Panel considers these various features to be sufficient for a finding that each of the disputed domain names are under common control, noting also that the Respondents did not dispute any of the Complainant's submissions in this respect.

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 Respondents") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel's comparison of the respective disputed domain names to the Complainant's mark is as follows:

The disputed domain names <mounjarodepobreoficial.shop>, <receitadomounjaro.online>, <anastasiacmounjaro.online>, <cheapmounjaro.app>, <mounjaronaturaloficial.com>, <mounjarodospobres.site>, <mounjaromaterno.shop>, and <mounjaro21dias.fun> each contain the Complainant's mark in its entirety coupled with various terms. Although the addition of such other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name concerned and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The disputed domain names <moujarodepobre.site> and <monjaroo.shop> contain variations of the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark. Under the second and third elements, panels will normally find that employing a misspelling in this way signals an intention on the part of the respondent (typically corroborated by infringing website content) to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

The Top-Level Domain suffixes in respect of the disputed domain names are typically disregarded under the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and have 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.

There is no evidence that any of the Respondents are commonly known by their respective disputed domain name. The record indicates that each of the disputed domain names is being used in connection with a website that offers third party products for sale or promotes such products, under prominent reference to the

Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark. Such commercial use, which is calculated to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's said mark and to confuse consumers into believing that the products on the associated website are in some way sponsored or endorsed by the Complainant, could not be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed sale of (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals or pharmaceutical-adjacent remedies, 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 Respondents' websites are offering for sale or promoting third party products under reference to the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark, typically offering a "poor man's" alternative or alleged natural remedy. The said mark is distinctive and is a made-up term. There is no reasonable likelihood that the Respondents came upon the term independently, particularly when the website content is factored into the equation. This demonstrates to the Panel's satisfaction that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names in the knowledge of the Complainant's mark and with intent to target it. The presence of various common features between the respective disputed domain names and websites as discussed above satisfies the Panel that the disputed domain names are under common control and that the bad faith intent which the Panel has found is common to the registrant(s) behind all of the disputed domain names.

Based on the present record, the Panel finds that by using the disputed domain names, the Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or of a product on such website. This constitutes registration and use in bad faith according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed sale of (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals or pharmaceutical-adjacent remedies, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondents' registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondents have not come forward to explain or otherwise discuss their registration and use of the disputed domain names. They have not addressed the Complainant's corresponding contentions nor put forward submissions or evidence in support of the notion that the disputed domain names, or any of them, were registered and have been used in good faith. In the absence of any such submissions and evidence, the Panel has not identified any matters that the Respondents might have raised in support of their case on this topic.

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 <anastasiacmounjaro.online>, <cheapmounjaro.app>, <monjaroo.shop>, <moujarodepobre.site>, <mounjarodepobreoficial.shop>, <mounjarodospobres.site>, <mounjaromaterno.shop>, <mounjaronaturaloficial.com>, <mounjaro21dias.fun>, and <receitadomounjaro.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: May 11, 2026