

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0010

Also in PDF C2026-0010

1. The Complainant

The Complainant is Whatsapp, LLC, having its office at 1601 Willow Road, Menlo Park California 94025 United States of America. The complainant has initiated the complaint via their authorized representative, David Taylor/ Jane Seager having their office at Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP 17, avenue Matignon 75008 Paris France.

2. The Domain Name and Respondent

The domain names upon which the Complaint is based on are; <gbwhatsap.pk>, <gbwhatsapp.net.pk>, <gbwhatsapp.pk>, <whatsappgbdownload.pk>, hereinafter will be referred to, as the Disputed Domain Names [DDNs].

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDNs are registered by pk36713 with the contact name GB Apps, with their address District DG Khan Tehsil, Taunsa Sharif and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDNs is pknicuser@gmail.com.

3. Procedural History

DNDRC was informed of the Complaint against the Respondent in accordance with the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy upon receiving notification from the Complainant on 24 December 2025. An administrative review of the Complaint was conducted and completed, following which the Complainant was notified of the compliance review's completion and the subsequent procedural requirements.

Upon the Complainant's fulfillment of the procedural requirements on 30 December 2025, and informing the Complainant of the above, on the same day. DNDRC formally requested the Respondent's registration details from PKNIC on 30 December 2025. PKNIC provided the requested details on 02 January 2026.

DNDRC issued a formal notification of the dispute to the Respondent on 17 January 2026, enclosing a copy of the Complaint and a Response Form, informing the Respondent that failure to submit a Response within 10 days would result in the dispute proceeding ex parte.

The Complaint along with all relevant material was referred to the appointed arbitrator for review and decision on 03 February 2026. The arbitrator completed the review and issued a decision on 20 April 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 20 April 2026.

Applying Paragraph 4(a) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the *Rules*), DNDRC appointed Mr. Ardavan D. Solan as the sole Arbitrator who has verified that the Complaint satisfies the formal requirements of the Policy and the Rules.

Factual Background

4. Parties Contentions

(a) Complainant

The Complainant's brief contentions are reproduced below:

The Complainant

5. *The Complainant, WhatsApp, LLC ("WhatsApp"), is a provider of one of the world's most popular mobile messaging applications ("apps"). Founded in 2009 and acquired by Meta Platforms, Inc. (formerly Facebook, Inc.) ("Meta") in 2014, WhatsApp allows users across the globe to exchange messages for free via smartphones, including iPhone and Android. WhatsApp's main website available at www.whatsapp.com also allows Internet users to access its messaging platform.*
6. *Since launching in 2009, WhatsApp has become one of the fastest growing and most popular mobile applications in the world, with over 3.3 billion monthly active users worldwide in November 20255. WhatsApp has acquired considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide, including in Pakistan. WhatsApp is one of the most downloaded applications in Pakistan and in the world.*

A screen capture of the Complainant's main website and copies of information about the Complainant, including its Wikipedia entry, press articles on Meta's acquisition of WhatsApp

in 2014, its application ranking and rapid growth and popularity worldwide, including in Pakistan, are provided as **Annex 5**.

7. Reflecting its global reach, the Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names consisting of or including its WHATSAPP trademark under a wide range of generic Top-Level Domains as well as under numerous country code Top Level Domains (**ccTLDs**), including <whatsapp.com>, <whatsapp.net>, <whatsapp.org>, <**whatsapp.pk**> and <**whatsapp.com.pk**> (Pakistan).

Copies of the WhoIs records for selected domain names comprising the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark are provided as **Annex 6**.

The Complainant's trademark

8. In addition to its strong online presence, the Complainant has secured ownership of numerous trademark registrations for WHATSAPP in many jurisdictions throughout the world, including in Pakistan, as detailed above.

The Domain Names and the associated Website

9. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark (or its misspelling "WHATSAP") with addition of the letters "gb" as well as the term "download", under the extensions ".net.pk" and ".pk".
10. All the Domain Names redirect to the same website at <https://gbappsapk.com.pk/> (the **Website**), which offers unauthorized modified APK versions of WhatsApp for download, such as "GB WhatsApp APK", "FM WhatsApp", "Yo WhatsApp", "OG WhatsApp", "Aero WhatsApp", "WhatsApp Transparent", "Royal WhatsApp" and "WhatsApp Prime" (**Annex 3**). The Website states:

"Whatsapp is among the most popular messaging apps with billions of active users across different platforms. The official version offers all the core features that a user needs for messaging, calling, and sharing. But to give some advanced features to the users, several Mod versions have been introduced. GB Whatsapp Download sits at the top of the list with unique and advanced features. [...]"

"GB version is a Mod entity that always brings more features than the official counterpart. To compare both the official and GB versions, you must consider factors that are features offered and user security. WhatsApp GB is way ahead of the official version in terms of features as it has all those features which help users to overcome official restrictions. But when it comes to device security and user

security, official WhatsApp takes the lead. It is an official app and much more secure than its Mod counterpart. [...]"

11. *In addition, the Website makes use of the green-and-white colour scheme used by the Complainant and prominently displays the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark and*

The logos, including the favicon, featured on the Website



The Complainant's WhatsApp logo



features logos that are similar to the Complainant's figurative trademark, including as a favicon, as follows:

12. *The Website contains tutorials on how to download and install the APK versions.*
13. *A disclaimer-style statement is displayed in the "About Us" section of the website, as follows:*

"Please note that GBWhatsApp is not an official app by WhatsApp Inc. and is developed by independent developers who aim to enhance your messaging experience. We do not endorse or promote any illegal or harmful activity using this app."

14. *The Complainant submits the present Complaint requesting transfer of the Domain Names to protect its rights and legitimate business interests.*

(b) Respondent

The Respondent did not make a submission.

5. Jurisdiction

The Panel's jurisdiction over this dispute between the Complainant and the Respondent is established by virtue of the Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) and the Rules.

The Respondent applied for and was granted registration of the DN on the basis of these regulations, and has submitted to, the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) and the Rules and correspondingly to the arbitral jurisdiction of the DNDRC and its arbitration decisions.

6. Discussion and Findings

The decision of the dispute shall be addressed with respect to the following aspects:

- I. Identical or confusing similarity with a trademark or service in which the Complainant has rights (a UDRP criteria).
- II. Legitimate interest in the domain name (a UDRP criteria).
- III. Registration and use of the domain name in bad faith (a UDRP criteria).

I. Identical or confusing similarity to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

- 15. *The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to establish first, that it has rights in a trademark or service mark, and secondly, that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to that trademark or service mark.*
- 16. *The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for WHATSAPP in jurisdictions throughout the world, including in Pakistan (Annex 4). The Complainant has therefore established trademark rights in WHATSAPP for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy..*
- 17. *The Domain Names incorporate the WHATSAPP trademark or its misspelling ("WHATSAP") with the addition of the following letters or terms:*

Domain Names	Additional letters and/or terms
<gbwhatsap.pk>	"gb"
<gbwhatsapp.net.pk>	"gb"
<gbwhatsapp.pk>	"gb"
<whatsappgbdownload.pk>	"gb", "download"

- 18. *As stated in WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7:*

"[...] in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trade mark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing."

19. *The Domain Name <gbwhatsapp.pk> consists of a common, obvious and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark with the omission of the letter "p". When compared with the Complainant's trademark, the "whatsapp" component of the Domain Name is visually highly similar and phonetically identical to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.9. See also Facebook, Inc. and WhatsApp, Inc. v. Domain Manager, NA, WIPO Case No. D2016-0394 (<whatsapp.com> et al.).*
20. *The Complainant submits that the presence of its WHATSAPP trademark or its misspelling WHATSAP in the Domain Names is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant's trademark.*
21. *As stated in WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8:*

"Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements."
22. *The Complainant submits that the addition of the letters or terms listed above does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, which remains clearly recognizable in the Domain Names. See WhatsApp LLC v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Muhammad Asif, WIPO Case No. D2022-3170 (<gbwhatsappdownload.com>).*
23. *The addition of the extensions ".net.pk" and ".pk" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessment under the first element, as they are a standard requirement of registration; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.*
24. *For reasons set out above, the Complainant submits that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

The Complainant, has submitted evidence of its trademark registrations around the world, including Pakistan for the WHATSAPP trademark, in Annex 4. Considering which, the Panel is therefore, satisfied that the Complainant has established ownership of the trademark WHATSAPP.

The Panel proceeds towards deducing whether the DDNs are confusingly similar with the Complainant's mark, as set out in Section(s) 1.7 and 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

As per the tests set out in the above; the DDNs are found to be confusingly similar to a trademark, if they adopt the entirety or a major portion of the trademark, regardless if any other terms are added as well. If the Panel finds the majority of a trademark, or recognizes the Complainant's trademark within the DDNs, the additions of other terms are considered merely descriptive, pejorative and meaningless, i.e. not being able to prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the two.

In this case, the prefixes and suffixes of "gb", and/or "download", among others, may be disregarded under the above test, since they are merely considered pejorative or meaningless. The addition of other terms like ".pk" are also disregarded henceforth, since they are necessary for registration in the relevant jurisdiction. Adding these terms does not in any way eliminate the confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark, especially considering the fact that every single one of the DDNs have incorporated the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark.

Due to a lack of response from the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the DDNs are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark in which the Complainant holds the applicable legal rights, without any vagueness.

II. Legitimate interests in a domain name

As per paragraph 4(c), the UDRP requires the Respondent's claim to be of legitimate interest and shall be:

"proved based on all evidence presented" that "shall demonstrate" the Respondent's "rights or legitimate interests to the domain name for purposes of [Paragraph 4\(a\)\(ii\)](#)."

Paragraph 4(c) states that:

"(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

25. *The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is unable to invoke any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy that would demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.*

The Respondent is not using the Domain Names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services

26. *The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent been authorized by the Complainant to make any use of its WHATSAPP trademark, in a domain name or otherwise.*

27. *As a preliminary matter, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is unable to be viewed as a bona fide service provider, as it is not providing sales or repairs in relation to a product provided by the Complainant. Rather, the Respondent is making unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademarks to promote third-party modified versions of WhatsApp. Nevertheless, even if one is to apply the Oki Data criteria⁹, the Respondent at least fails to fulfil the first, third and fourth Oki Data criteria (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.8):*

(i) The Website purports to offer for download unauthorized modified versions of the Complainant's WhatsApp application. As such, the Respondent cannot be said to be using the Domain Names to offer the goods or services at issue, namely the WhatsApp application.

(iii) While the Website displays a disclaimer-like statement, the Respondent does not accurately or prominently disclose its lack of relationship with the Complainant. In fact, the disclaimer is barely visible, accessible by clicking on the "About Us" tab. In addition, the Website features modified versions of the Complainant's figurative trademark and logo, including as favicon, as well as a similar green and white colour scheme to that of the Complainant's WhatsApp app, which suggests endorsement by/affiliation with the Complainant.

(iv) By registering five Domain Names, each targeting the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has

attempted to "corner the market" in domain names reflecting the Complainant's marks.

28. As mentioned above, the APK versions are modified versions of WhatsApp, developed by a third party. The Complainant is committed to maintaining the integrity of its WhatsApp service and does not support such third-party applications. As such, the Respondent is making unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Names and on the Website, to offer services that violate the Complainant's Terms of Service¹⁰. Such use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services. See *WhatsApp, Inc. v. Nasser Bahaj*, WIPO Case No. D2016-0581 (<ogwhatsapp.org>et al.):
29. The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent is not using the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Names

30. The registrant information for the Domain Names is redacted in the publicly-available WhoIs record database (**Annex 2**). Apart from the email address support@gbappsapk.com.pk, the Website does not display any contact information. Therefore, the identity of the Domain Names owner is unknown.
31. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, there is no evidence of the Respondent having obtained or applied for any trademark registration or similar right for "whatsapp", or any variation as reflected in the Domain Names.
32. The Respondent's use of the Domain Names to promote unauthorized WhatsApp APKs does not support any reasonable claim of being commonly known by the Domain Names, nor does it give rise to any reputation in the Domain Names themselves, independent of the Complainant's trademark rights.
33. The Respondent therefore cannot legitimately claim that it is commonly known by the Domain Names, in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names

34. Nor is the Respondent currently making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy..

35. *Prior UDRP panels have consistently held that such use of the Domain Names to offer for download unauthorized modified versions of WhatsApp does not amount to legitimate noncommercial or fair use. See WhatsApp LLC v. Furqan Taunsvi, Buch Executive Villas, WIPO Case No. DCC2024-0012 (<gbwhatsapp.cc>et al.).*
36. *Therefore, the Complainant has established a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Accordingly, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with evidence to rebut the Complainant's case. In the absence of such evidence, the Complainant may be deemed to have satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1.*

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

According to the test set out in Section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview, the Panel shall apply and discern whether the Respondent, lacks any legitimate interest in the relevant DDNs. The overall burden of proof in such proceedings lies on the Complainant, but the Panel recognizes that proving that the Respondent lacks legitimate interest in the DDNs results in the often difficult task of “proving a negative”. As such, when a Complainant makes out a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks any rights legitimate interest in the DDNs, the burden of proof in this element, would shift onto the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interest in the DDNs. If the Respondent fails to come forth with such relevant evidence, as stated above, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

One of the Complainant’s initial claims is that the Respondent is not “commonly known” by the DDNs; purporting that the absence of registrant information in the WhoIs record database and a lack of information on the website points to the Respondent not having any renown. While the Panel also notes, that the only username for all these DDNs, identifies the Respondent as; pk36713, raising further doubts on the reputation of the entity. The afore-mentioned evidence clearly demonstrates that the Respondent is not commonly known by the DDNs (See WIPO Overview 3.0 Section 2.3).

The Panel also finds, that the use of the DDNs, in order to promote unauthorized modified versions of WhatsApp, shows intent to mislead internet users towards third party APK versions of the WhatsApp application and/ or to tarnish the trademark or service mark of the Complainant. Thus, the above shows that the Respondent was obviously not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names (See *WhatsApp LLC v. Furqan Taunsvi, Buch Executive Villas WIPO Case No. DCC2024-0012*)

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interest in the DDN, upon which the burden of proof has shifted to the Respondent to prove otherwise. Since the Respondent has not submitted a response, they have failed to satisfy the burden shifted upon them.

Considering all the above arguments, the Panel therefore deduces that the Respondent does not have any legitimate interest in the DDNs.

III. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

37. *Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy lists four factors which, in particular but without limitation, may be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy..*
38. *The Complainant submits that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the policy, as well as for reasons that go beyond the non-exhaustive list of circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy..*

Registration in bad faith

39. *The Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark is inherently distinctive and well known throughout the world in connection with its messaging application, having been continuously and extensively used since the respective launching of its services, and acquiring considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide, including in Pakistan (**Annex 5**).*
40. *All top results obtained by typing "WhatsApp" into the Google search engine available at www.google.com and www.google.com.pk refer to the Complainant.*

*Copies of the Google search results are provided as **Annex 7**.*

41. *Given the Complainant's renown and goodwill worldwide and particularly its popularity and trademark rights well established prior to the registration of the Domain Names, the Respondent could not credibly claim that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark when it registered the Domain Names between 2022 and 2025. See, for example, *WhatsApp Inc. v. Francisco Costa*, WIPO Case No. D2015-0909 (<webwhatsapp.com>, **registered in 2012**).*

42. *The content of the Website clearly demonstrates the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks, as it makes prominent reference to the Complainant and purports to offer for download unauthorized versions of the Complainant's application. The Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark is a coined term, exclusively associated with the Complainant and its messaging services. All these factors clearly indicate the Respondent's intent to target the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Names. See WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.2.1 as well as WhatsApp Inc., Facebook, Inc. v. Alex Xu, HKITN, WIPO Case No. D2019-1709 (<whatsapp-marketinghk.com> et al.).*
43. *The Complainant further submits that by registering five Domain Names each targeting the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent has engaged in a bad-faith pattern of abusive domain name registration, further highlighting the Respondent's bad faith.*
44. *The Complainant submits that the Respondent, having no relationship with the Complainant or authorization to make use of its trademark in a domain name or otherwise, registered the Domain Names with a view to promoting unauthorized APK versions of the Complainant's messaging application, in bad faith.*

Use in bad faith

45. *Given the confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant's trademark, and the content of the Website as described above, Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the Website is somehow affiliated with or otherwise endorsed by the Complainant, which it is not the case.*
46. *The Website offers for download unauthorized modified versions of the WhatsApp application, developed by a third party. It is more likely than not that the owner of such third-party application ultimately derives commercial advantage from the Respondent's unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Names and on its website. Prior UDRP panels have held that commercial gain may include the respondent gaining or seeking reputational and/or bargaining advantage, even where such advantage may not be readily quantified; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.3.*
47. *The Complainant therefore submits that by using the Domain Names in this fashion, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website and the goods and services marketed therein, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See WhatsApp LLC v. Gulsher Khan, WIPO Case No. D2024-0910 (<gbwhatsappdownloadapk.net> et al.)*

48. *Furthermore, the promotion of unauthorized modified APK versions of the WhatsApp application not only violates the WhatsApp Terms of Service but also places the security of WhatsApp users at risk. The Respondent's use of the Domain Names to offer unauthorized APK versions under the Complainant's trademark disrupts the Complainant's business by driving WhatsApp users to third-party applications. Prior panels have held that such activities amount to use of a domain name in bad faith. See WhatsApp, LLC v. Adila Ayaz, Freelance, WIPO Case No. D2024-2999 (<gbwhatsapp.gold>et al)*
49. *Moreover, the Website displays WhatsApp's figurative trademark and its variations and is using the same distinctive green-and-white colour scheme as that used by the Complainant (Annex 3), thereby creating a misleading impression of association with the Complainant. See WhatsApp LLC v. Nayan Borse and Mohd Syazuan Saad, Bix Charity Kb, WIPO Case No. D2023-3186 (<easywasap.com> et al.).*
50. *Finally, although the Website features a disclaimer-like statement, it is not displayed prominently, accessible by clicking on the "About Us" tab. The Complainant submits that even if a prominent disclaimer had been featured on the Website, it would not have been sufficient to cure the Respondent's illegitimate use of the Domain Names; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.7. See also Instagram, LLC v. Protection of Private Person / Yurii Shemetilo / Olha, WIPO Case No. D2022-2832 (<insta-stories.online>et al.).*
51. *In view of the above, the Complainant submits that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

The Complainant, has submitted that the DDNs have been registered and are being currently used in bad faith. The Panel has already recognized the renown and goodwill that the Complainant has acquired over the years of being a messaging application, resulting in the trademark of the Complainant gaining considerable reput, worldwide. Hence, the Respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark and of having no knowledge of the Complainant's existence in the market, specifically since a simple internet search would have revealed the same. (See WIPO Overview 3.0 Section 3.2.2)

In addition to the above, the clear incorporation of the Complainant's green and white colour scheme and logo designs in their favicon, furthers the above argument, solidifying the Respondent's intent to duplicate the appearance and outlook of the Complainant's trademark in a manner that exhibits prior knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and the Respondent lacking

good faith at the time of the registration. (See *WhatsApp Inc. v. Francisco Costa WIPO Case No. D2015- 0909*).

A further indication to support the inference of bad faith is that the Respondent aimed to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the goods and services offered therein, with the Complainant's trademark. Prior UDRP Panels have considered such indications to support findings of the use of such DDNs, in bad faith (See *WhatsApp LLC v. Gulsher Khan WIPO Case No. D2024-0910*).

Furthering the finding of bad faith, is the fact that the Respondent registered 4 DDNs, each of which, in some regard, constitutes of, or incorporates the Complainant's mark; highlighting a pattern of registering abusive domain names. This phenomena is considered as "wilful blindness" since the Respondent neglected any good faith efforts to screen such registrations against already available online databases to avoid the registration of trademark abusive domain names (See WIPO Overview 3.0 Section 3.2.3).

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent both; registered, and is using the DDNs in bad faith.

6 Decision

Upon reviewing the contentions and information provided by the Complainant above, the Panel acknowledges that the "WhatsApp" mark is registered and owned by the Complainant and the Respondent has no trademark rights over it. The continuous use of these DDNs may adversely affect the business and could jeopardize the reputation of the Complainant by amounting to confusion of ownership of the DDNs even if they might be situated in different and separate jurisdictions.

Taking all the above discussion into consideration, the Panel concludes and decides that:

1. The DDNs are confusingly similar to the registered trademark of the Complainant;
2. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the DDNs;
3. The DDNs were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Policy, the Panel, therefore, recommends that PKNIC transfer the registration of the DDNs <gbwhatsap.pk>, <gbwhatsapp.net.pk>, <gbwhatsapp.pk> and <whatsappgbdownload.pk>, to the Complainant, as prayed, within 48 hours of receipt of this decision either by email or through the website where it will be uploaded,

www.dndrc.com/cases_resolved/, whichever is earlier. The Complainant shall also be at liberty to contact PKNIC for implementation of this decision.

Arbitrator: Ardavan D. Solan

Sole Panelist

Date: 20 April 2026