

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2025-0034

Also in PDF C2025-0034

1. The Complainant

The Complainant is Syed Ammar Hussain Jaffri, having its office at 1st Floor, Ali Plaza, 27-E, A.K AKM Fazl-ul-Haq Rd, G 6/3 Blue Area, Islamabad. The Complainant has initiated the Complaint through their authorized representative, Mr. Muhammad Tauseef, with their address at 1st Floor, Ali Plaza, 27-E, A.K AKM Fazl-ul-Haq Rd, G 6/3 Blue Area, Islamabad

2. The Domain Name and Respondent

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

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by Khubaib Kamran, with their address House No 242/2; Area Eid Ghaa; Multan Cannt; Multan, and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is khubaiblogics@gmail.com.

3. Procedural History

The Secretariat was informed of the Complaint against the Respondent in accordance with the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy upon receiving notification from the Complainant on 01 December 2025.

The Secretariat completed an administrative check of the Complaint on 04 December 2025 and issued a formal notification of the dispute to the Respondent on 05 December 2025, 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.

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 Panelist 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 seeks the following remedy:

The Complainant requests that the Panel issue a decision that the domain name <sdgsacademy.pk> be transferred to the Complainant.

(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 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

In the landmark case of *Standard Chartered PLC v. Hosting Campus Domain* (case no. C20070001) available on the DNDRC website (http://www.dndrc.com/cases_resolved/pdf/c20070001.pdf), the Panel laid down the following four heads under which to analyze cases, under the Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) and the UDRP:

1. *Illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity of the Application & Registration (a criteria in terms of the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy June 20, 2006 version 4.1 in addition to the criteria of the UDRP)*
2. *Identical or confusing similarity to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (a UDRP criteria)*
3. *Legitimate interest in Domain Name (a UDRP criteria)*
4. *Registration and use in bad faith (a UDRP criteria)*

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

- i. *Illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity with respect to the Application & Registration (a PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-0819) criteria).*
- ii. *Identical or confusing similarity with a trademark or service in which the Complainant has rights (a UDRP criteria).*
- iii. *Legitimate interest in the domain name (a UDRP criteria).*
- iv. *Registration and use of the domain name in bad faith (a UDRP criteria).*

I. Illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity of the Application & Registration

The PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) states that it creates an exception for, and thus excludes the registration of a domain name that:

- a. *infringes upon a registered tradename,*
- b. *is not bona fide as recognized by international best practice,*
- c. *in the opinion of PKNIC, a contravention of the latest version of the Pakistan Penal Code Act, 1860 (including offences of defamation & blasphemy)/ Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997/any applicable criminal law,*
- d. *has been declared by a Criminal Court of appropriate jurisdiction to have contravened the latest version of Pakistan Penal Code Act, 1860 (including offences of defamation & blasphemy)/Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997/any applicable criminal law), or*
- e. *in the opinion of PKNIC is not appropriate for registration.*

As per the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19),

If a party claims that a domain name already registered with PKNIC violates their registered tradename, an obvious derivation of their registered company name is not bona fide as recognized by international best practice, and is a contravention in the opinion of PKNIC to be a contravention of the latest version of the Pakistan Penal Code Act, 1860 (including offences of defamation & blasphemy)/ Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997/any applicable criminal law, PKNIC reserves the right to cancel, or transfer the domain to the claiming party as per the ICANN's Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy [UDRP] (with PKNIC amendments) or as per the orders of a court judgment in Pakistan.

Therefore, for the purpose of assessing illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity of the Application & Registration of the DDN, the application and registration of the DDN shall be assessed in consideration of the following criteria:

- i. Whether the DDN infringes upon a registered trade name / trademark?
- ii. Whether the application and/or registration of the DDN is bona fide?
- iii. Whether the application and/or registration of the DDN contravenes the Pakistan Penal Code, 1860 (the “Penal Code”) or any applicable criminal law?

Neither the Complainant nor the Respondent has specifically provided any submissions in this regard.

The Panel has independently assessed the Complainant’s complaint together with the annexures on record. It notes that, under PKNIC’s Policy, the Respondent is using the DDN to impersonate the Complainant. The annexures demonstrate that the Respondent’s website is a near-identical replication of the Complainant’s website and further reveal the unauthorised use of the name and physical address of the Complainant’s founder, a well-known and reputable individual in this field. Such use is likely to mislead internet users into believing that the DDN is operated or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Panel further notes the Complainant’s reliance on Pakistan’s Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act, 2016, including allegations relating to electronic forgery and spoofing. While the Panel does not make determinations under national criminal law, the alleged conduct is consistent with the type of deceptive and abusive behaviour that the Policy is designed to prevent.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the DDN was unlawfully registered by the Respondent, who, at the time of registration, would have been aware of the Complainant’s prior use of the DDN and its established reputation.

Although a finding of illegality alone would be sufficient to dispose of the matter, the Panel, for the sake of completeness, proceeds to consider the remaining elements of the Policy below.

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

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

A. The Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's Mark.

The Disputed Domain Name, <sdgsacademy.pk>, is identical to the Complainant's service mark "SDGS ACADEMY." The Complainant has established common law rights to this mark through continuous use and registration of the domain since 2019. The Complainant originally registered the domain and maintained it for several years, as evidenced by PKNIC Credit Card Charge Receipts from 2019, 2021, and 2023, billed to "citdomains". The domain inadvertently expired in August 2025, at which point it was opportunistically seized by the Respondent.

The Respondent has not made any submissions.

The Complainant contends that the DDN is identical to its service mark "SDGS ACADEMY," in which it has established rights through long-standing use. In support of this contention, the Complainant submits evidence demonstrating continuous and bona fide use of the mark since 2019, including proof of registration and renewal of the corresponding domain name over several years. The record includes PKNIC credit card charge receipts from 2019, 2021, and 2023, billed to "citdomains," evidencing the Complainant's ownership and control of the domain prior to its expiration in August 2025.

In accordance with well-established principles reflected in WIPO Overview 3.0 (section 1.7), the test for identity or confusing similarity requires a direct comparison between the textual components of the Complainant's mark and the DDN, to determine whether the mark is recognizable within the DDN.

The Panel first considers whether the Complainant has rights in the mark "SDGS ACADEMY." While the Complainant does not rely on a registered trademark, it has provided sufficient evidence of common law rights arising from continuous and consistent use of the mark in connection with its services since 2019. Panels have consistently recognized that unregistered or common law trademarks may satisfy the first element of the Policy where the complainant demonstrates that the mark has acquired distinctiveness through use (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.3).

Turning to the comparison between the mark and the DDN, the Panel notes that <sdgsacademy.pk> reproduces the Complainant's mark "SDGS ACADEMY" in its entirety, without alteration. In line with established practice, the country-code Top-Level Domain ".pk" is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity analysis, as it is a technical registration requirement and does not serve to distinguish the DDN from the mark (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1).

In the absence of any response or evidence to the contrary from the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the DDN is identical to the Complainant's "SDGS ACADEMY" mark, in which the Complainant has established common law rights. The Complainant has therefore satisfied the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

III. 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(a)(ii) 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:

B. The Respondent Has No Rights or Legitimate Interests in the Domain Name

The Respondent has no connection to the Complainant and no authorization to use the "SDGS ACADEMY" mark. The Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests is conclusively demonstrated by the following:

The Respondent has unlawfully incorporated the fundamental details of the Complainant's original website into their infringing site. Specifically, the Respondent is displaying the name of the Complainant, Mr. Syed Ammar Hussain Jaffri, as well as his official address, to masquerade as the genuine owner. This is not a bona fide use; it is a fraudulent act of identity theft.

Mr. Ammar Jaffri holds an utmost respectable reputation in the sector. By misappropriating his name and physical address, the Respondent is actively exploiting this reputation to deceive the public. The Respondent is "stealing" the public's trust by making visitors believe they are interacting with the Complainant's legitimate organization. Such fraudulent misrepresentation prevents any finding of a legitimate interest.

The Respondent is not using the domain for a bona fide offering of goods or services. The domain was registered solely to capitalize on the Complainant's failure to renew the domain on time.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "SDGS Academy" or "Ammar Jaffri," nor do they operate any legitimate business under these names. The only "interest" the Respondent has shown is a criminal intent to defraud.

The Respondent has not made any submission.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. In particular, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no connection with, and has never been authorized by, the Complainant to use the "SDGS ACADEMY" name or mark in any manner.

In accordance with section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the Complainant must first establish a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. Once such a case is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has clearly established a *prima facie* case. The Complainant has confirmed that it has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the “SDGS ACADEMY” mark. There is no evidence of any relationship or affiliation between the Parties.

Moreover, the Complainant has submitted annexures showing that the Respondent has unlawfully copied and displayed core identifying details from the Complainant’s original website. This includes the unauthorised use of the Complainant’s name, Mr. Syed Ammar Hussain Jaffri, as well as his official physical address. This further indicates that the Respondent does not have any independent legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel further notes the Complainant’s submission that the Complainant enjoys a strong and respectable reputation in the relevant sector. By misappropriating his name and address, the Respondent is seeking to exploit this reputation to deceive internet users into believing that the website associated with the DDN is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name to impersonate a complainant or pass off as the complainant is inherently illegitimate and precludes any finding of rights or legitimate interests (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.1).

There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “SDGS Academy” nor that the Respondent operates any legitimate business under these names.

The Respondent has not submitted any response or evidence to rebut the Complainant’s *prima facie* case. In the absence of such rebuttal, and given the clear evidence of impersonation, deception, and lack of authorization, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not making a bona fide or legitimate use of the DDN.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN, and that the Complainant has satisfied the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

IV. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

C. The Domain Name Was Registered and Is Being Used in Bad Faith.

The Respondent's conduct falls within the definition of bad faith registration and use. The Complainant's registration expired in August 2025. The Respondent immediately "snapped up" the domain, knowing of its prior value and traffic. This "drop-catching" of a known trademark for the purpose of exploitation is evidence of bad faith. The Respondent has constructed a website that mirrors the Complainant's original site. This active cloning is done with the intent to defraud the public. By presenting the website as the genuine "SDGS Academy," the Respondent is violating Pakistan's Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act, 2016 (PECA):

- ***Violation of Section 13 (Electronic Forgery):*** *The Respondent has forged the digital identity of the Complainant.*
- ***Violation of Section 24 (Spoofing):*** *The Respondent has established a website with a counterfeit source to trick visitors into believing it is the authentic platform.*

The impersonating website is actively soliciting money and personal information from visitors by falsely claiming affiliation with the Complainant's platform. This creates a severe risk of financial loss to the public and reputational destruction to the Complainant.

The Complainant previously moved for the Rapid Suspension in Serious Criminal Matters (RSSCM) regarding this domain. On October 15, 2025, DNDRC proceedings noted prima facie evidence that the domain is being used to conduct online fraud. The continued possession of the domain by the Respondent allows for ongoing criminal activity.

The Respondent has not made any submissions.

The Complainant contends that the DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith, and the Panel finds this contention well-founded based on the totality of the circumstances.

The Complainant has provided information suggesting that the Complainant had owned and used the DDN for several years before it expired in August 2025. The Respondent immediately registered the domain following its expiration period.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent knew, or at the very least should have known, of the Complainant and its rights in the "SDGS ACADEMY" name at the time of registration. The DDN is identical to the Complainant's identifier. Proceeding with registration in these circumstances, without any plausible good-faith explanation, supports the finding of bad faith in accordance with WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.2.

More significantly, the Respondent has used the DDN to construct a website that closely mirrors the Complainant's original website. This deliberate cloning, combined with the use of the Complainant's name and identifying details, demonstrates a clear intent to impersonate the Complainant and deceive Internet users. The Panel finds that such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it evidences an intentional attempt to attract internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The Complainant has also submitted that the impersonating website is actively soliciting money and personal information from visitors by falsely claiming affiliation with the genuine SDGS Academy platform. This activity creates a serious risk of financial harm to the public and substantial reputational damage to the Complainant. Use of a domain name for fraudulent purposes, including phishing and identity-based deception, has repeatedly been held by prior panels to constitute clear evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Respondent has not submitted any response to refute these serious allegations or to provide any good-faith explanation for its conduct. In the absence of any rebuttal, and considering the cumulative evidence of opportunistic registration, impersonation, and fraudulent use, the Panel finds that the DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

7. Decision

Upon reviewing the contentions and information provided by the Parties, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the "sdgsacademy.pk" mark and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. Therefore, the continuous use of the DDN adversely impacts the exercise of the Complainant's trademark and common law rights and jeopardizes the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant by creating a likelihood of confusion regarding the source and ownership of the services.

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

1. The Respondent's registration of the DDN violates the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19);
2. The DDN is confusingly similar to the registered trademark of the Complainant;
3. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the DDN;

4. The DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Policy, the Panel, therefore, recommends that PKNIC transfer the registration of the DDN <sdgsacademy.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: 18 December 2025