

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Eli Lilly and Company v. Filler bliz  
Case No. D2026-3639

### **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 Respondent is Filler bliz, Germany.

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

The disputed domain name <mounjarodeutschland.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 August 13, 2026. On August 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 17, 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 August 17, 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 August 18, 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 August 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Roger Staub as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 Eli Lilly and Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Indiana, United States, and a well-known global pharmaceutical company. Under the MOUNJARO brand, the Complainant offers a pharmaceutical preparation to improve blood sugar control in adults with type 2 diabetes. The Complainant submits that it launched the product in June 2022, and by the end of 2022, the product produced nearly USD 280 million in revenue. The Complainant's 2025 year-end financial report announced the product produced over USD 22 billion dollars worldwide in the 2025 fiscal year. The MOUNJARO brand product has been referred to as a "blockbuster" success and has received substantial media coverage worldwide.

The Complainant owns, inter alia, the following trademark registrations consisting of the element "MOUNJARO":

- United States Trademark Registration No. 6809369 for MOUNJARO registered on August 2, 2022, in Class 5; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 18209187 for MOUNJARO registered on September 8, 2020, in Class 5.

Further, the Complainant owns a domain name <mounjaro.com>, which redirects to <mounjaro.lilly.com>. The domain name is used to advertise and provide information regarding the Complainant's MOUNJARO product.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 9, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website showing MOUNJARO branded products alongside directly competitive third-party products.

#### **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 the following:

First, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's highly distinctive mark MOUNJARO and the geographic term "deutschland" in addition to the generic Top-Level Domain ".com". It is well settled that the addition of a geographic term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Second, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services nor making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with a privacy shielding service to direct Internet traffic to a website that purports to sell the

Complainant's MOUNJARO brand product without any apparent prescription in jurisdictions in which the product has not been legally approved for distribution, alongside directly competitive third-party products, all without disclosing the Respondent's lack of a relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent fails to meet all of the Oki Data requirements and has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent purports to offer the Complainant's goods for sale but appears to offer gray market or counterfeit goods. The MOUNJARO brand product is only available for sale in a limited number of jurisdictions, but the Respondent's website checkout process permits users to purchase and ship MOUNJARO products worldwide. The Respondent offers for sale competing third-party products such as "Wegovy" and "Ozempic". The Respondent fails to accurately disclose its relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant. The Respondent has also listed a false contact address of 697 Hilltop Street, Springfield, MA, United States, on the website, to which the disputed domain name resolves. Finally, the Complainant has not given the Respondent permission, authorization, consent, or license to use its MOUNJARO mark in the disputed domain name.

Third, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is purporting to sell the Complainant's own goods under the disputed domain name, which is comprised of the Complainant's mark accompanied only by a geographic term. This is, itself, indicative of bad faith registration and use. The Respondent is using the Complainant's mark to drive Internet traffic to its website to profit from the sale of gray market or otherwise counterfeit products, all while concealing its identity. The use of the Complainant's MOUNJARO mark, official product images and the branding as "Mounjaro Germany," mislead users into believing that there is an association between the Complainant and the website.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to the Policy, to qualify for a transfer, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

First, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Third, the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Since the Respondent did not submit a response, the Panel may accept the reasonable, supported contentions of the Complainant as true. This Panel will determine whether those facts constitute a violation of the Policy that is sufficient to order the transfer of the disputed domain name (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#)).

### **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, the geographical term “deutschland”) may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed 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.

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 counterfeit goods or (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes (i) the inherent distinctiveness of the Complainant’s trademark, (ii) the considerable commercial success of the Complainant’s product offered under the Complainant’s MOUNJARO mark, (iii) the composition of the disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant’s mark and geographical term “deutschland” (which means “Germany” in German), (iv) the geographic spread of the Complainant’s trademark registrations for MOUNJARO, which covers, inter alia, the European Union country Germany, where the Respondent purports to be located, (v) the disputed domain name having been used to guide

Internet users to a website where products are offered which according to the Complainant's undisputed submission are counterfeit and/or competing with the Complainant's products, (vi) the Respondent's failure to disclose its lack of relationship with the Complainant on the website, to which the disputed domain name resolves, and (vii) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response. All this suggests that the disputed domain name has been registered and used with the intent to mislead and attract Internet users for commercial gain, which denotes bad faith.

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 <mounjarodeutschland.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Roger Staub/*

**Roger Staub**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2026