

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0005

Also in PDF C2026-0005

1. The Complainant

The Complainant is Starbucks Corporation, having its office at 2401 Utah Avenue South Seattle, WA 98134, Washington, USA. The Complainant has initiated the complaint via their authorized representative, Jennifer Davis, Focal PLLC having their office at Focal PLLC 900 1st Avenue S., Ste. 201 Seattle, WA 98134, USA.

2. The Domain Name and Respondent

The domain name upon which the Complaint is based upon is <starbucks1usa.pk>, is hereinafter referred to as the Disputed Domain Name [DDN].

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by convex with the contact name Aamir Irfan, with their address at Suite No 803; 8th floor; Ibrahim Trade Tower and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is aamir@convexinteractive.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 11 December 2025. An administrative review of the Complaint was conducted and completed on 12 December 2025, following which the Complainant was notified of the compliance review's completion and the subsequent procedural requirements on the same day.

Upon the Complainant's fulfillment of the procedural requirements on 19 December 2025, DNDRC formally requested the Respondent's registration details from PKNIC on 22 December 2025. PKNIC provided the requested details on 23 December 2025.

DNDRC issued a formal notification of the dispute to the Respondent on 29 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.

The Complaint along with all relevant materials was referred to the appointed arbitrator for review and decision on 12 January 2025. The arbitrator completed the review and issued a decision on 23 February 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 24 February 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

Trademark(s) or service mark(s) on which the Complaint is based and, for each mark, describe the goods or services, if any, in connection with which the mark is used. Complainant is the owner of all rights in and to the STARBUCKS mark in connection with a wide variety of goods and services. Complainant owns numerous trademark and service mark registrations for the STARBUCKS mark in the United States and around the world. For example, Complainant owns numerous U.S. trademark registrations for the STARBUCKS mark in connection with a wide variety of goods and services, including but not limited to the following:

Mark	STARBUCKS
Registration/Application No.	U.S. Reg. No. 1,372,630 (<i>Annex 2 at page 8</i>)
Registration Date	November 26, 1985
Goods/Services	IC 021: Coffeepots, cups, mugs and canisters (first use: 11/1/1983; first use in commerce:11/1/1983)

Mark	STARBUCKS
Registration/Application No.	U.S. Reg. No. 1,452,359 (<i>Annex 2 at page 9</i>)
Registration Date	August 11, 1987

Goods/Services	IC 030: Coffee, tea, herb tea, chocolate and cocoa (first use: 3/29/1971; first use in commerce: 3/29/1971)
-----------------------	--

Mark	STARBUCKS
Registration/Application No.	U.S. Reg. No. 1,444,549 (<i>Annex 2 at page 10</i>)
Registration Date	June 23, 1987
Goods/Services	IC 035: Retail store services and distributorship services for coffee, tea (first use: 3/29/1971; first use in commerce: 3/29/1971) IC 043: Coffee cafe services (first use: 3/29/1971; first use in commerce: 3/29/1971)

Mark	STARBUCKS
Registration/Application No.	U.S. Reg. No. 3,259,720 (<i>Annex 2 at page 11</i>)
Registration Date	July 10, 2007
Goods/Services	IC 038: Providing multiple user dedicated access to the Internet (first use: 8/21/2002; first use in commerce: 8/21/2002)

Mark	STARBUCKS
Registration/Application No.	U.S. Reg. No. 3,330,858 (<i>Annex 2 at page 12</i>)
Registration Date	November 6, 2007
Goods/Services	IC 035: Business administration; business management; franchising, namely, providing technical assistance in the establishment and/or operation of restaurants, cafes, coffee houses and snack bars; providing technical assistance in the establishment and/or operation of restaurants, cafes, coffee houses and snack bars (first use: 3/31/2004; first use in commerce: 3/31/2004)

Mark	STARBUCKS
Registration/Application No.	U.S. Reg. No. 3,907,156 (<i>Annex 2 at page 13</i>)
Registration Date	January 18, 2011
Goods/Services	IC 035: Providing sound and music listening equipment in retail stores for customers to preview audio recordings prior to purchase (first use: 10/2/2007; first use in commerce: 10/2/2007) IC 042: Providing search engines for obtaining data via communications networks; providing search engines for obtaining data on a global computer network; Internet services, namely, creating indexes of information, sites, and other resources available on global computer networks for others; searching, browsing, and retrieving information, sites, and other resources on global computer networks for others, namely, providing information at the specific request of end-users by means of global computer networks (first use: 10/2/2007; first use in commerce: 10/2/2007)

In addition, Complainant owns trademark registrations for its STARBUCKS mark in numerous other countries, including but not limited to multiple registrations in Australia (see Annex 3), Canada (see Annex 4), the European Union (see Annex 5), Israel (see Annex 6), New Zealand (see Annex 7), and Singapore (see Annex 8). Currently, Complainant owns 1,942 trademark registrations in 182 jurisdictions, and 127 trademark applications in 55 jurisdictions for the STARBUCKS mark.

(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:

Complainant is the owner of all rights in and to the STARBUCKS mark in connection with a wide variety of goods and services. Complainant owns numerous trademark and service mark registrations for the STARBUCKS mark in the United States and around the world (see Annexes 2-8).

Complainant, along with its predecessor-in interest, has used its STARBUCKS mark since the opening of its first store in 1971. In its 50 years of existence, STARBUCKS has developed into a brand that is known worldwide and used in connection with a wide variety of goods and services. Currently, Complainant has approximately 41,097 Starbucks stores in 87 markets around the world. Additional detail about Complainant and its famous STARBUCKS mark can be found at www.starbucks.com/about-us/company-information/starbucks-company-timeline.

Thus, Complainant indisputably owns the rights to the STARBUCKS mark, including the U.S. registrations for the mark identified above. Complainant's use of the STARBUCKS mark dates back decades. Complainant's registrations for the STARBUCKS mark establish Complainant's rights in, and ownership of, the STARBUCKS mark. See CenturyLink Intellectual Property LLC v. Above.com Domain Privacy / Protection Domain, WIPO Case No. D2017-0144 (complainant established trademark rights in its mark by virtue of numerous registrations); Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., et al. v. Voguechen, WIPO Case No. D2014-0657 ("A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner.").

*The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's STARBUCKS mark. Panels have routinely held that the addition of generic or descriptive terms (like, in this instance, "1" or "usa") does not sufficiently distinguish a domain name that incorporates a complainant's mark in its entirety. See, e.g., Bayerische Motoren Werke AG ("BMW") v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, et al., WIPO Case No. D2017-0156 ("It is established that, where a mark is the distinctive part of a disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is considered to be confusingly similar to the registered mark."); Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., et al. v. Voguechen, WIPO Case No. D2014-0657 (finding that the use of the "non-significant element[s]" "prom" and "dresses" in disputed domain name did not sufficiently distinguish the domain name from complainant's well known VOGUE trademark); Nikon, Inc., et al. v. Technilab, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2000-1774 ("[W]hen a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's registered mark, that is sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy."); Starbucks Corporation v. starbucks dealership, WIPO Case No. D2023-0337 ("in view of the fact that in this case, the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's STARBUCKS Trademark, the addition of hyphen and the term "franchise" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's Trademark."), Starbucks Corporation v. Name Redacted, WIPO Case No. D2022-3284 ("It is the consensus view of UDRP panels that, where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark."). See also WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("**WIPO Overview 3.0**"), section 1.7 ("[I]n cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, . . . the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing."). Here the disputed domain name, <starbucks1usa.pk> is confusingly similar to Complainant's STARBUCKS mark and incorporates the STARBUCKS mark in its entirety.*

As a result, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's famous STARBUCKS mark and Complainant has therefore satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

The detailed table provided by the Complainant illustrates that the Complainant has registered the "Starbucks" trademark in multiple jurisdictions around the world. This is sufficient to establish the Complainant's rights in the "STARBUCKS" mark.

Furthermore, a simple analysis of the DDN reveals, that the entirety of the trademark has been incorporated into the DDN with the addition of terms such as "1", "usa" or ".pk" the last of which is a ccTLD, and can be disregarded due to its necessary nature for registering in certain

jurisdictions (see WIPO Overview 3.0 Section 1.7). Hence, an initial indication of confusing similarity between the DDN and the mark has been established in accordance with Section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

To further examine whether the additional suffix(s) can diminish such a finding, we shall consider the terms of; “1” and “usa” under general UDRP standards. According to Section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the addition of such terms are considered as merely “descriptive”, “meaningless”, “pejorative”, etc. and of such a nature as to not diminish a finding of confusing similarity, especially after it is already confirmed that the entire trademark has been incorporated into the DDN.

Due to the reasons above, the Panel finds the DDN to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

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:

The Policy requires Respondent to demonstrate one of the following circumstances to show “rights or legitimate interests” in the domain name at issue:

“(i) before any notice to you [Respondent] 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 [Respondent] (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 [Respondent] 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.”

Policy, Paragraph 4(c). None of these circumstances is present in this case.

*First, Respondent was undoubtedly aware of Complainant’s STARBUCKS mark when the disputed domain name was registered. According to the Domain Tools Lookup database, the disputed domain name was registered on March 25, 2022 (see **Annex 1**). As demonstrated above, Complainant has consistently used the STARBUCKS mark since it opened its first store in 1971 and now has thousands of stores worldwide. Given that long usage and the resulting fame of the STARBUCKS mark, there can be no dispute that Respondent was well aware of Complainant’s STARBUCKS mark when they registered the disputed domain name. See, Starbucks Corporation v. Hoang Van Ha, Tran Quoc Trung, and Nong Duc Manh, WIPO Case No. D2023-5056 (finding that the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark STARBUCKS as the brand of one of the world’s largest coffeehouse chains is clearly established, and that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the confusingly similar disputed domain names, especially because the disputed domain names redirected to websites in which the Complainant’s trademark and logo were reproduced, and personal information was solicited.), and CenturyLink Intellectual Property LLC v. Above.com Domain Privacy / Protection Domain, WIPO Case No. D2017-0144 (finding that, where complainant used the CENTURYLINK mark since at least June 2009, respondent was likely aware of complainant’s mark when it registered the disputed domain names beginning in November 2009); Tata Sons Ltd. v. TATA Telecom Inc./Tata-telecom.com, et al., WIPO Case No. D2009-0671 (drawing “a strong inference that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and the Complainant’s TATA mark, and that the Respondent in fact registered the disputed domain name with the aim of trading on the strength and reputation of the Complainant’s mark”).*

Second, there is no evidence to support an argument that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Third, Complainant has never licensed or otherwise authorized Respondent's use of its STARBUCKS mark in any domain name, much less the confusingly-similar domain name at issue. See Suncor Energy Inc. v. Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc./andre bechamp, WIPO Case No. D2012-2123 (noting that, "in the absence of any license or permission from a complainant to use well-known trademarks, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the domain name could reasonably be claimed"); Sanofi-Aventis v. Abigail Wallace, WIPO Case No. D2009-0735 (finding that complainant had established a prima facie case that respondent did not have rights or legitimate interests "due to the fact that the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use [Complainant's] trademark, or a variation thereof").

*Fourth, evidence of Respondent's improper commercial use of the disputed domain name refutes any possible claim of a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name. Specifically, as of the date of filing of this Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that use Complainant's intellectual property in the website content in order to deceptively suggest an endorsement by or affiliation with the Complainant that does not exist (see **Annex 9**). The content of the site suggests that the site is intended to be used solely for commercial purposes. Panels have found that this type of a use negates any possible legitimate use. See, e.g., Atlassian Pty Ltd v. Contact Privacy Inc. / Evan Janke, The Janke Company, WIPO Case No. D2019-2229 (concluding that a Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith when it "has been used to disrupt the Complainant's business and attract Internet users looking for the Complainant to the Respondent's site which deliberately mimicked the Complainant's official web site in order to confuse Internet users and represent that the Respondent's site was connected to the Complainant when it was not for commercial gain and suspected phishing purposes").*

Even if Respondent used the disputed domain name for a different purpose in the future, the fact remains that Complainant has no control over how Respondent may use the disputed domain name. See, e.g., Conair Corp. v. Pan Pin, et al., WIPO Case No. 2014-1564 (finding that "the presence of the Domain Name in the hands of the Respondent represents . . . an abusive threat hanging over the head of the Complaint (i.e., an abuse capable of being triggered . . . at any time) and therefore a continuing abusive use"); Westdev Ltd. v. Private Data, WIPO Case No. D2007-1903 ("[T]he fact that the Domain Name . . . is out of [Complainant's] control and in the hands of a third party . . . is itself an abusive threat hanging over the Complainant's head and falls to be condemned under the Policy. ").

In either event, the evidence demonstrates that Respondent is using Complainant's STARBUCKS mark for commercial purposes without the authorization of Complainant and in the absence of any cognizable right or legitimate interest in that mark. See Tata Sons Ltd. v. TATA Telecom Inc./Tata telecom.com, et al., WIPO Case No. D2009-0671 (finding that

respondent's use of complainant's mark "to trade on Complainant's goodwill and reputation precludes any bona fide offering of goods or services under . . . the Policy").

As a result, Respondent cannot establish that they have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. The Respondent has neither been authorized nor licensed to use the Complainant's STARBUCKS trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant or any of its subsidiaries. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has never been permitted to incorporate or use the STARBUCKS mark in any manner.

Under established UDRP practice, it is 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 (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has successfully established such a prima facie case under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

First, the Complainant has neither licensed nor otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its STARBUCKS trademark. Given the mark's longstanding use since 1971 and its global reputation, it is well established that the Respondent was likely to be aware of the Complainant's reputation, and the registration of the DDN was therefore made in bad faith and lack of authorization. The DDN currently resolves to a website that reproduces the Complainant's STARBUCKS mark and incorporates elements of its mark, creating a misleading impression that the site is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Secondly, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the DDN or by the STARBUCKS mark, as contemplated under paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent's identity, as reflected in the publicly available WHOIS information, does not correspond to the DDN or to the STARBUCKS mark.

Thirdly, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the DDN under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The DDN resolved to a website that reproduces the Complainant's mark and design elements in a manner that may mislead Internet users into believing there is an

affiliation with the Complainant. The website's content is clearly commercial in nature, which negates any possible claim of bona fide or legitimate use. Panels have consistently held that using a complainant's mark in this manner constitutes commercial use and demonstrates a lack of rights or legitimate interests (See WIPO Case No. D2019-2229 and Case No. D2014-1564).

The fact that Complainant has established its rights in the STARBUCKS mark and has demonstrated the Respondent's unauthorized use of the DDN, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to show rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. The Respondent has not submitted any response 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. 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:

A number of factors indicate the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

First, as described above, Complainant's use and registration of its STARBUCKS mark long predated Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. See, e.g., Sanofi-Aventis v. Abigail Wallace, WIPO Case No. D2009-0735 (finding it suggestive of bad faith that complainant's trademark was registered in 2005, long before respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2008). And there can be no credible dispute that Respondent was aware of Complainant's STARBUCKS mark when it registered the disputed domain name. Panels routinely hold that such knowledge supports a finding of bad faith. See, e.g., Bayerische Motoren Werke AG ("BMW") v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, et al., WIPO Case No. D2017-0156 (finding it "inconceivable" that respondents selected the disputed domain names without knowledge of complainant where they operated websites "clearly promoting a business which supplies technical information" about complainant's products); CenturyLink Intellectual Property LLC v. Above.com Domain Privacy / Protection Domain, WIPO Case No. D2017-0144 (finding that domain names were registered and used in bad faith based in part on finding that respondent was likely aware of complainant's mark when domain names were registered); VKR Holding A/S v. Li Pinglong, WIPO Case No. D2016-2269 (finding that the disputed domain name "was registered and used by the Respondent with knowledge of the Complainant" and "Respondent's actions therefore constitute bad faith registration and use"); Valentino S.p.A

v. Qiu Yufeng, et al., WIPO Case No. D2016-1747 (“Registration of a domain name that incorporates a complainant’s well-known trade mark suggests opportunistic bad faith.”).

Second, where, as here, “a domain name is so obviously connected with a Complainant, its very use by a registrant with no connection to the Complainant suggests ‘opportunistic bad faith’.” Tata Sons Ltd. v. TATA Telecom Inc./Tata-telecom.com, et al., WIPO Case No. D2009-0671. Moreover, even if Respondent derives “no immediate commercial benefit, it is still taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant’s mark to divert Internet users to [his] website through confusion.” Wal Mart Stores, Inc. v. WalMart Careers, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2012-0285.

Thus, there is ample evidence to demonstrate that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

While deducing whether the Respondent registered and is using the DDN in bad faith, a simple analysis of the DDN along with an overview of the content of the website suffices, in order to answer the contemplation. Incorporating the entire “Starbucks” name into the DDN, indicates the Respondent’s prior knowledge of the brand, and an intent to emulate the name, since such a word, is almost never a part of regular everyday vocabularies.

Noting, the near worldwide reach and renown of the Complainant’s mark and the goods/ services they provide, not to mention the ease of using internet search engines to inquire the same, the Respondent knew or should have known that registration of the DDN would result in it being identical or confusingly similar to the Starbucks mark. The failure to conduct such simple research before registration is considered as an indication of bad faith (See WIPO Overview 3.0 Section 3.2.2).

Furthermore, the DDN purports to a website consisting of a near- perfect replica of the Starbucks logo and design. With the words “Coming soon” underneath the logo, aiming to confuse internet users into thinking that this DDN may be endorsed by, or affiliated with the Complainant, which is not the case. Despite, the fact that there are no goods or services being offered on the website, prior Panels have deduced that, the reproduction of the Complainant’s mark within the content displayed on the DDN’s website, creating confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation and/ or endorsement of the Respondent’s website, without displaying a clear disclaimer establishing a lack of relationship between the Respondent and Complainant, is a clear indication of bad faith (See Valentino S.p.A v. Qiu Yufeng, et al, WIPO Case No. D2016-1747).

Keeping all of the above arguments in mind, the Panel concludes that the Respondent both; registered, and is using the DDN in bad faith.

7. Decision

Upon reviewing the contentions and supporting evidence submitted by both Parties, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established all elements required under the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy and the UDRP. The Panel recognizes that the “Starbucks” 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 above discussions 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, and;
3. 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 <starbucks1usa.pk> to the Complainant, as prayed, within 48 hours of receipt of this decision either by email or through its publication on the official 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: 24 February 2026