

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0007

Also in PDF C2026-0007

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 name upon which the Complaint is based is <gbwhatsappplus.pk>, hereinafter referred to as the Disputed Domain Name [“the DDN”].

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by APK Bundles, with the contact name being APK Bundles, with their address being Mohalla Shumali Chah Ghallu Wala Tehsil Taunsa Sharif District DG Khan and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is apkbundles@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. DNDRC completed an administrative review of the Complaint and communicated the same to the Complainant on 30 December 2025.

The Complainant had fulfilled their procedural obligations on 04 July 2025, pursuant to an earlier consolidated complaint therefore, 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 09 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 26 January 2026. The arbitrator completed the review and issued a decision on 10 March 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 17 March 2026.

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

4. Factual Background

(a) Complainant

The Complainant's brief contentions are reproduced below:

The Complainant

- 1. 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. Its main website available at <http://www.whatsapp.com/> also allows Internet users to access its messaging platform..*
- 2. Since its launch 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 20253. 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 4**.

3. 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). For instance, <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 5**.

The Complainant's trade marks

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

The Domain Name and the associated website

5. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark with the addition of the letters "gb" as well as the term "plus" under the ccTLD ".pk".
6. Until on or around 18 December 2025, the Domain Name redirected to a website at <https://gbappsapk.com.pk/5> (Website) which offered a download of unauthorized modified APK versions of WhatsApp such as "GB WhatsApp APK", "GB WhatsApp Download", "FM WhatsApp", "Yo WhatsApp", "WhatsApp Aero", "OG WhatsApp", "WhatsApp Plus" and "Delta WhatsApp". The Website stated:

"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. [...]"

The first thing you will get here in this Mod is the complete facility of status download. You can save others' statuses from your contact list in one tap with complete anonymity. It offers original video quality and HD photo downloads for WhatsApp statuses."

7. *In addition, the Website made use of the green-and-white colour scheme used by the Complainant and prominently displayed the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark and featured logos that were similar to the Complainant's figurative trademark, including as a favicon, as follows:*

The logos, including the favicon, featured on the Website



The Complainant's WhatsApp logo



8. *The Website contained tutorials on how to download and install the APK versions.*
9. *A disclaimer-style statement was displayed in the "About Us" tab 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."

*Screen captures of the website to which the Domain Name redirected as at 17 December 2025, together with evidence of redirection are provided as **Annex 6**.*

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

Therefore, the Complainant seeks the following remedy:

In accordance with Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy, the Complainant requests that the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding transfer the Domain Name to the Complainant.

(b) Respondent

The Respondent has not submitted any response.

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 DDN 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:

1. ***The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark***
(Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i); Rules, paragraphs 3(b)(viii), (b)(ix)(1)).

11. *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 name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark or service mark.*
12. *The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for WHATSAPP in jurisdictions throughout the world, including in Pakistan (Annex 3). The Complainant has therefore established trademark rights in WHATSAPP for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.*
13. *The Domain Name was registered under the ccTLD ".pk" and incorporates the WHATSAPP trademark with the addition of the letters "gb" and the term "plus".*
14. *As stated in WIPO Overview 3.0, [section 1.7](#):*

"[...] in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, 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."
15. *The Complainant submits that the presence of its WHATSAPP trademark in the Domain Name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark.*
16. *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."
17. *The Complainant submits that the addition of the letters "gb" as a prefix and the term "plus" as a suffix does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, which is clearly recognizable in the Domain Name. See *WhatsApp, Inc. v. Adila Ayaz, Freelance*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2999 (<anwhatsapp.pro> et al.) and *WhatsApp LLC v. Younus Waqar*, DNDRC Case No. 2024-0009 (<gbwhatsapps.pk>).*

18. *The addition of the ccTLD ".pk" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessment under the first element, as it is a standard requirement of registration; see WIPO Overview 3.0, [section 1.11.1](#)*
19. *For reasons set out above, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has not submitted any response.

The Complainant contends that the DDN is confusingly similar to its WHATSAPP trademark. For the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel undertakes a comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the DDN to determine whether the mark is recognizable within the domain name.

The Panel notes that the Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks for WHATSAPP in jurisdictions worldwide, including in Pakistan, thereby establishing trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy.

The DDN incorporates the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the letters "gb" as a prefix and the term "plus" as a suffix, under the country-code top-level domain ".pk". As stated in section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a complainant's trademark, or where a dominant feature of the mark is clearly recognizable within the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that trademark for the purposes of the first element.

The Panel further finds that the addition of the letters "gb" and the term "plus" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Pursuant to section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the addition of descriptive, meaningless, or other non-distinctive terms to a complainant's trademark does not avoid confusing similarity where the trademark remains clearly recognizable within the domain name. This approach has been consistently applied in prior cases involving the Complainant, including *DNDRC Case No. 2024-0004*, and *WIPO Case No. D2024-2999*.

The Panel also notes that the ccTLD ".pk" is a technical requirement of domain name registration and may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity, in line with section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the DDN is confusingly similar to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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:

2. **The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name**
(Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii); Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(2))

20. *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 Name.*

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

21. *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.*
22. *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 has made 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 criteria, the Respondent at least failed to fulfil the first and third Oki Data criteria (see WIPO Overview 3.0, [section 2.8](#)) :*
 - i.) *The Website purported to offer for download unauthorized modified versions of the Complainant's WhatsApp application. As such, the Respondent cannot be said to have used the Website to offer the goods or services at issue, namely the WhatsApp application.*
 - ii.) *The Website did not accurately and prominently disclose its lack of relationship with the Complainant. The disclaimer was hardly visible as it was placed in the "About Us" tab on the Website. In addition, the Website prominently displayed the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, together with the Complainant's figurative trademark and its variations, and made use of the same green-and-white colour scheme used by the Complainant. The Website may therefore have misled Internet users into believing that it was operated or authorized by the Complainant, when in fact it was not.*
23. *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 has made unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Name and on the Website, to offer services that violate the Complainant's Terms of Service. 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.). See also WhatsApp, Inc. v. Abdallah Almqbali, WIPO Case No. D2016-1287 (<watsabsplus.com> et al.).*
24. *The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent is not using the Domain Name 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 Name

25. *The registrant information for the Domain Name is redacted in the publicly-available WhoIs record database (see Annex 2). Other than the generic email address support@gbappsapk.com.pk, there was no contact information on the Website (see Annex 6). Therefore, the identity of the Domain Name owner is unknown.*
26. *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", as reflected in the Domain Name.*
27. *The Respondent's use of the Domain Name to promote unauthorized WhatsApp APKs does not support any reasonable claim of being commonly known by the Domain Name, nor does it give rise to any reputation in the Domain Name itself, independent of the Complainant's trade mark rights.*
28. *The Respondent therefore cannot legitimately claim that it is commonly known by the Domain Name, in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.*

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

29. *Nor is the Respondent currently making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.*
30. *Prior UDRP panels have consistently held that such use of the Domain Name to purport to offer for download an unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application does not amount to legitimate noncommercial or fair use. See WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Ramzan, WIPO Case No. D2025-0340 (<gbwhatsapp-lite.com>) and WhatsApp LLC v GB Plus, DNDRC Case No. C2024-0006 (<gbwhatsapp.org.pk> et al.).*
31. *The Complainant submits that in light of the above factors, it has established a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. 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 any response.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN, noting that the Respondent neither uses the DDN for any bona fide or legitimate purpose nor holds any authorization, whether express or implied, to incorporate or otherwise use the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has never been permitted to make any use of its trademarks.

Under established UDRP practice, it is generally recognized that requiring a complainant to prove the absence of a respondent's rights or legitimate interests would amount to proving a negative. Panels therefore assess whether a complainant has established a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, upon which the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate otherwise. In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established such a prima facie case under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1 and *WIPO Case No. D2015-1149*.

Firstly, the Complainant has neither licensed nor otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its WHATSAPP trademark, rendering any claim to a bona fide offering of goods or services through the DDN untenable. The Respondent's website offers unauthorized modified versions of the Complainant's WhatsApp application for download. Prior panels have held that offering unauthorized modified versions of a complainant's application does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy; see *WIPO Case No. D2016-0581*, *WIPO Case No. D2025-0340*. The Respondent's website prominently displays the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, along with variations of its figurative marks and logos, without any disclaimer of affiliation, which may mislead Internet users into believing it is operated or authorized by the Complainant.

Secondly, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the DDN or by the Complainant's mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The publicly available WHOIS information for the DDN is redacted, the Respondent's disclosed name ("APK Bundles") bears no resemblance to the DDN, and there is no evidence that the Respondent owns or has applied for any trademark rights corresponding to "whatsapp" or "gbwhatsappplus." The Respondent's use of the DDN does not establish any independent reputation separate from the Complainant's trademark rights.

Thirdly, the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the DDN without intent for commercial gain or to misleadingly divert consumers, within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The Respondent's use of the DDN to promote unauthorized third-party applications clearly fails this criterion.

In view of the foregoing, the burden of production has shifted to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. The Respondent has failed to submit any response, argument, or evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the DDN, and the Complainant has therefore satisfied the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

III. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

3. **The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith**
(Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii), 4(b); Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3))
32. *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.*
33. *The Complainant submits that paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy is of particular relevance in the present case, although there are other factors not listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy that further indicate bad faith, as explained in more detail below.*

Registration in bad faith

34. *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 4**).*
35. *All of the leading search 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**.*

36. *Prior UDRP panels have repeatedly recognized the strength and renown of the Complainant's trademark and have ordered the transfer of disputed domain names to the Complainant. See *WhatsApp, Inc. v. Domain Manager*, *SHOUT marketing SL*, and *Gonzalo**

*Gomez Rufino, River Plate Argentina, and Gonzalo Gomez Rufino, SHOUT Marketing SL, WIPO Case No. D2018-1581 (<whatsappalertas.com> et al.)*¹¹.

37. *In light of the above, the Complainant submits that the Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant or its WHATSAPP trademark when registering the Domain Name in July 2023. See WhatsApp Inc. v. Francisco Costa, WIPO Case No. D2015-0909 (<webwhatsapp.com>).*
38. *Further, the nature of the Respondent's website clearly demonstrated actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark, as it made prominent reference to the Complainant, its WHATSAPP trademark and official application, and featured variations of the Complainant's WhatsApp logo and figurative trademark, including as a favicon. See WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.2.1 and WhatsApp, LLC v. Muhamamd Faizan Elahi, DNDRC Case No. 2025-0001 (<whatsappgb.org.pk>, registered in 2023).*
39. *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, knowingly proceeded to register the Domain Name, carrying a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, with a view to using the Domain Name to promote unauthorized APK versions of its messaging application, in bad faith.*

Use in bad faith

40. *Given the confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark, and the prior 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 is not the case.*
41. *The Website offered for download unauthorized modified versions of the WhatsApp application, developed by a third party. The Complainant submits that it is more likely than not that the owner of such third-party applications ultimately derived commercial advantage from the Respondent's unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Name 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.*
42. *The Complainant therefore submits that by using the Domain Name in this fashion, the Respondent has intentionally attempted 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.ne> et al.).

43. *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 Name to offer unauthorized APK versions under the Complainant's trademark disrupted 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.).*
44. *Finally, although the Website featured a disclaimer-like statement, it was not displayed prominently, accessible by clicking on the "About Us" tab on the Website. 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 Name; see WO3, 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.).*
45. *In view of the above, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has not submitted any response.

The Complainant contends that the DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant submits that the Respondent intentionally seeks to attract internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, misleading users as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services offered thereon. The Panel acknowledges these contentions and considers paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP Policy to be directly applicable, while also taking into account other contentions and evidences of bad faith apparent from the record.

The Panel finds that the DDN was registered in bad faith, as the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark is inherently distinctive and enjoys worldwide recognition through continuous use since its launch as evidenced by internet search results which strongly associate "WhatsApp" with the Complainant, making it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of its rights. Prior panels have

recognized the mark's prominence and ordered the transfer of DDNs in similar cases; see *WIPO Case No. D2018-1581* and *WIPO Case No. D2015-0909*.

The Respondent's bad faith intent is further evidenced by the content of the website associated with the DDN, which prominently references the Complainant, its WHATSAPP trademark, and official application, and displays variations of the Complainant's figurative mark. Such conduct demonstrates a deliberate attempt to exploit the Complainant's goodwill; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.1, and *WIPO Case No. D2025-0321*.

Moreover, the DDN resolves to a website promoting an unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application, likely conferring commercial or reputational benefits to the Respondent or third parties. Such use of the DDN to attract Internet users by creating confusion regarding affiliation, endorsement, or source clearly constitutes bad faith; see *WIPO Case No. D2016-2299*.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's website contains no prominent disclaimer regarding the lack of association with the Complainant, and even if such a disclaimer existed, it would not suffice to remedy the illegitimate use of the DDN; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.7 (*WIPO Case No. D2016-0608*).

Considering all of the above, and in the absence of any response from the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith. Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

7. Decision

Upon reviewing the contentions and supporting evidence submitted by both Parties, the Panel recognizes that the "WHATSAPP" mark is registered to the Complainant, and the Respondent has no legitimate rights over it. Therefore, the continuous use of the DDN pertaining to the Complainant's registered trademark could result in hinderance in exercise of the rights of the Complainant in the trademark and could also jeopardize the reputation of the Complainant by amounting to confusion regarding the ownership of the DDN.

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

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

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Policy, the Panel therefore directs that the registration of the DDN <whatsappgb.com.pk> be transferred to the Complainant, as requested, within forty-eight (48) hours of receipt of this decision, either by email or through its publication on the official website www.dndrc.com/cases_resolved/, whichever is earlier. The Complainant shall also remain entitled to approach PKNIC directly for enforcement of this decision.

Arbitrator: Muhammad Amaan Latif

Sole Panelist

Date: 10 March 2026