

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Eli Lilly and Company v. Troy Collan, Abdul Rauf Raza, Namecheap Org Pk, Muhammad QASIM, Eman Fatima, Tech Space, Laiba Latif, john james
Case No. D2026-3685

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 Troy Collan, United States; Abdul Rauf Raza, Namecheap Org Pk, Pakistan; Muhammad QASIM, United Kingdom; Eman Fatima, Tech Space, Pakistan; Laiba Latif, Pakistan; and john james, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <buymounjaroonlineeurope.org>, <mounjarosweden.org>, <mounjarobuyonlinefrance.org>, <buymounjaroaustralia.com>, <mounjarodenmark.org>, <mounjarospain.org>, <buymounjaroinemexico.org>, <buymounjarocanada.org>, <mounjarobuyonlineuae.com>, <mounjaroitaly.com> and <mounjaroonlinepharmacy.org> are registered with Cloudflare, Inc.

The disputed domain names <mounjaroindonesia.org> and <mounjaromalaysia.org> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited.

The disputed domain names <mounjaromalta.com> and <mounjaroalbania.org> are registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu.

The disputed domain names <mounjaroportugal.org> and <mounjaroluxembourg.org> are registered with Netim SAS.

The disputed domain name <buymounjaroeurope.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC.

The disputed domain name <mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org> is registered with Hosting Ukraine LLC.

The above registrars are jointly referred to in this Decision as the "Registrars".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 17, 2026. On August 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 18 – 21, 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 August 25, 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed amendments to the Complaint on August 27 and September 4, 2026.

On August 25, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org> is Russian. On August 27, 2026, the Complainant reiterated its request that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent Laiba Latif, registrant of the disputed domain name <mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org>, did not submit any comments on the Complainant’s language request.

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 Respondents in English and Russian of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on September 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 multinational pharmaceutical company founded in 1876 in the United States. One of the Complainant’s recent products is Mounjaro (Tirzepatide), an injectable pharmaceutical product for the treatment of type 2 diabetes, approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration on May 13, 2022, and launched in the United States in June 2022. In 2025, Mounjaro generated sales of over USD 22 billion worldwide. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the product has received marketing authorisations in more than 60 countries. The Complainant uses the domain name <mounjaro.com> registered on October 21, 2019, which redirects to <mounjaro.lilly.com>, for its official website for the Mounjaro product.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for MOUNJARO (the “MOUNJARO Trademark”), including the following representative registrations:

- the United States trademark MOUNJARO with registration No. 6809369, registered on August 2, 2022 for goods in International Class 5; and
- the European Union trademark MOUNJARO with registration No. 018209187, registered on September 8, 2020 for goods in International Class 5.

The details about the dates of registration of the disputed domain names, the Registrars and the registrants, are included in the table that follows:

Disputed domain name	Date of registration	Registrar	Registrant
<mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org>	October 24, 2025	Hosting Ukraine LLC	Laiba Latif
<buymounjaroeurope.com>	January 22, 2026	NameSilo, LLC	Troy Collan
<buymounjaroonlineeurope.org>	February 12, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjarosweden.org>	February 28, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjarodenmark.org>	February 28, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<buymounjarocanada.org>	February 28, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjarobuyonlinefrance.org>	April 1, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjarospain.org>	April 1, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjarobuyonlineuae.com>	April 1, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjaroitaly.com>	April 1, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjaroidonesia.org>	April 8, 2026	Nicenic International Group Co., Limited	Abdul Rauf Raza, Namecheap Org Pk
<mounjaromalaysia.org>	April 8, 2026	Nicenic International Group Co., Limited	Abdul Rauf Raza, Namecheap Org Pk
<buymounjaroaustralia.com>	April 23, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<buymounjaroinmexico.org>	April 23, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjaroonlinepharmacy.org>	April 23, 2026	Cloudflare, Inc.	Eman Fatima, Tech Space
<mounjaroinportugal.org>	June 1, 2026	Netim SAS	Muhammad QASIM
<mounjaroluxembourg.org>	June 1, 2026	Netim SAS	Muhammad QASIM
<mounjaromalta.com>	June 11, 2026	Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu	john james
<mounjaroalbania.org>	June 11, 2026	Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu	john james

The disputed domain names <buymounjaroonlineeurope.org>, <mounjarosweden.org>, <mounjarobuyonlinefrance.org>, <buymounjaroaustralia.com>, <mounjarodenmark.org>, <mounjarospain.org>, <buymounjaroinmexico.org>, <mounjarobuyonlineuae.com>, <mounjaroitaly.com>, <mounjaroidonesia.org>, and <mounjaroonlinepharmacy.org> currently resolve to websites that display the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark and logo and offer for sale the Mounjaro product.

The disputed domain names <buymounjarocanada.org>, <mounjaromalta.com>, <mounjaroinportugal.org>, <mounjaromalaysia.org>, <mounjaroalbania.org>, <mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org>, <mounjaroluxembourg.org>, and <buymounjaroeurope.com> are currently inactive.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, all disputed domain names resolved to highly similar websites that displayed the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark and logo and images of the Complainant's Mounjaro medicine, offered this medicine for sale through a link "Buy Now" with statements that suggested that the product can be delivered worldwide and without prescription, and did not include a disclaimer for the absence of a relationship with the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its MOUNJARO Trademark, because they all incorporate the MOUNJARO Trademark in its entirety and add descriptive or geographic terms. The Complainant notes that the addition of descriptive terms to the Complainant's MOUNJARO trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and does not negate the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark. According to the Complainant, the geographic terms in the disputed domain names enhance the confusion, because customers seeking the Complainant's product will potentially assume that the disputed domain names are the Complainant's websites for its MOUNJARO product in those locations.

According to the Complainant, the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, because they are not commonly known by the disputed domain names and have not been authorised by the Complainant to use the MOUNJARO Trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents are not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant points out that the Respondents have used the disputed domain names to attract Internet traffic to websites that sell gray market or counterfeit copies of the Complainant's MOUNJARO product without a prescription and offer worldwide shipping (either explicitly advertised or apparent through their ordering processes), and target jurisdictions in which the product may not be legally authorised for distribution, all without disclosing the Respondents' absence of any relationship with the Complainant, which leads Internet users to falsely believe that the websites at the disputed domain names are the Complainant's official websites or that the Respondents are authorised distributors of the MOUNJARO product. The Complainant states that the Respondents therefore fail to meet all of the Oki Data requirements and have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant adds that there is no identifying information for the providers of the websites at the disputed domain names, such as business names or legitimate physical addresses, on the majority of the websites at the disputed domain names, and these websites use the Complainant's official marketing images of the MOUNJARO auto-injector pens without authorisation.

The Complainant also points out that many of the websites at the disputed domain names explicitly state that they allow users to buy MOUNJARO product without a prescription, while others allow users to purchase the product without a prescription via their ordering processes.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Complainant notes that it has extensively marketed its MOUNJARO product in the United States and in other jurisdictions around the world, and that, despite having been on the market only since June 2022, the MOUNJARO product has been referred to as a “blockbuster” success and has received substantial media coverage worldwide.

The Complainant points out that the disputed domain names combine the Complainant’s MOUNJARO Trademark with descriptive and geographic terms and have been used for the sale of gray market or counterfeit products, using the Complainant’s MOUNJARO Trademark and branded product imagery. According to the Complainant, this shows that the Respondents have intentionally attempted 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 trademark. The Complainant adds that the Respondents are using the disputed domain names to offer prescription-only products without any apparent requirement for a prescription and in jurisdictions where prescriptions are otherwise not yet available, which further supports a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant also notes that the Respondents Laiba Latif and Muhammad Qasim were respondents in *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*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0846](#), while the Respondent Abdul Rauf Raza was a respondent in *Eli Lilly and Company v. Abdul Rauf Raza*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4937](#), and *Eli Lilly and Company v. Abdul Rauf Raza*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0364](#). In all of these cases, the relevant Respondents were found to have registered domain names in bad faith. According to the Complainant, this shows that the Respondents have engaged in a continued pattern of bad faith conduct.

B. Respondents

None of the Respondents replied to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the registration agreements for the disputed domain names is English, except the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org>, which is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requests that the language of the proceedings be English with the arguments that the registrant of the disputed domain name <mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org> appears to have sufficient knowledge of the English language, because the website associated with this disputed domain name is entirely in English, that the Complainant would incur significant expenses if the proceeding is held in Russian, and that the proceeding would be significantly delayed if all documents will have to be translated into Russian. The Complainant adds that all Parties to these proceedings appear to be familiar with the English language, so they will suffer no prejudice if the proceedings are held in that language.

The Center has made all its communications to the Parties in these proceedings in English and Russian, and has informed all Respondents that they may submit comments to the Complainant's proposed language of the proceedings in their Responses, which may be filed in either Russian or English. None of the Respondents, including the registrant of the disputed domain name <mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org>, made any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

B. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. It alleges that the registrants of the disputed domain names are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or are under common control. The Complainant submits that the consolidation will permit multiple domain name disputes arising from a common nucleus of facts and involving common legal issues to be heard and resolved in a single administrative proceeding, and that the shared interests of the parties would be promoted in avoiding unnecessary duplication of time, effort, and expense.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's consolidation 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 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period between October 24, 2025, and June 11, 2026. Each of them incorporates the Complainant's MOUNJARO Trademark, combined with dictionary terms or geographic terms, and the associated websites have had identical or very similar design and content, and that they offer or have offered the Complainant's MOUNJARO product without a prescription and with worldwide shipping. In the absence of any evidence pointing to a different conclusion and of any objection by the Respondents to the Complainant's consolidation request, this supports a conclusion that the disputed domain names are under common control.

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 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 the MOUNJARO Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the MOUNJARO trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the MOUNJARO Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "buy", "online", "europe", "sweden", "france", "australia", "denmark", "spain", "in", "mexico", "canada", "uae", "italy", "pharmacy", "malta", "albania", "portugal", "luxembourg", "indonesia", and "malaysia") 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 MOUNJARO Trademark 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 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.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the distinctive MOUNJARO Trademark of the Complainant and have been used for websites that offered for sale MOUNJARO-branded products without requiring a prescription, although the Complainant's product is a prescription medicine. The Respondents' websites have also offered these products with worldwide shipping, which means that they can be delivered to jurisdictions where the Complainant's product has not received marketing authorisation yet. The Respondents' websites also do not disclose the absence of a relationship with the Complainant.

All the above supports a conclusion that the Respondents have used the disputed domain names for illegitimate sales of prescription medicines by misleading Internet users, which may potentially put their

health at risk. Such use of the disputed domain names can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondents.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondents' registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and have been used for websites offering for sale MOUNJARO-branded products without requiring a prescription and with unrestricted delivery to countries where the Complainant's product has not received marketing authorisation yet. This leads the Panel to the conclusion that the Respondents must have been well aware of the Complainant's Mounjaro product and of the MOUNJARO Trademark when registering the disputed domain names and when activating the associated commercial websites. Such conduct may confuse and mislead Internet users and potentially put their health at a significant risk.

The Complainant also notes that the Respondents Laiba Latif, Muhammad Qasim, and Abdul Rauf Raza were respondents in previous proceedings under the Policy, where they were found to have acted in bad faith. This supports a finding that these three Respondents have engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondents have registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith and 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.com>, <buymounjarocanada.org>, <buymounjaroeurope.com>, <buymounjaroinmexico.org>, <buymounjaroonlineeurope.org>, <mounjaroalbania.org>, <mounjarobuyonlineeurope.org>, <mounjarobuyonlinefrance.org>, <mounjarobuyonlineuae.com>, <mounjarodenmark.org>, <mounjaroidonesia.org>, <mounjaroinportugal.org>, <mounjaroitaly.com>, <mounjaroluxembourg.org>, <mounjaromalaysia.org>, <mounjaromalta.com>, <mounjaroonlinepharmacy.org>, <mounjarospain.org>, and <mounjarosweden.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: October 9, 2026