

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0002

Also in PDF C2026-0002

1. The Complainant

The Complainant is Space Exploration Technologies Corp, having its office at 1 Rocket Road, Hawthorne, California, USA. 90250. The Complainant has initiated the Complaint vide their authorized representative, Khalid Daudpota & Co, with their address at Suite No. 306, Horizon Tower, Block 3, Clifton 75600, Karachi, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Respondent

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

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by Zohaib Siddiqui with the contact name Zohaib Siddiqui, with their address at Clock Tower, Faisalabad, and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is talk@zohaibsiddique.info.

3. Procedural History

DNDRC was informed of the Complaint against the Respondent as per PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy, by notification from the Complainant on 27 August 2025 after which DNDRC completed its compliance review on 30 August 2025.

Following the completion of DNDRC procedures by the Complainant on 05 September 2025, DNDRC requested the Respondent’s details from PKNIC on 06 September 2025. PKNIC provided the requisite information on 13 September 2025.

The Respondent was issued a notification of the dispute along with a copy of the Complaint and a Response Form on 17 September 2025 informing the Respondent that if a Response was not

received 10 days from the notification, the dispute would be proceeded ex parte. The Respondent submitted the Response Form on 18 September 2025.

The Complaint, along with all relevant material was referred to the appointed arbitrator for review and decision on 19 September 2025. On 13 October 2025, the Panelist requested for additional information from the Respondent, requesting it to be submitted by 24 October 2025. On 13 October 2025, the Respondent sought a confirmation for fulfillment of procedural requirements under the Supplemental Rules. DNDRC provided the confirmation on 23 October 2025 and extended the deadline for submission of requested information until 31 October 2025. The Respondent submitted a response on 31 October 2025.

On 02 December 2025, the Response Form along with the additional information submitted by the Respondent, was transmitted to the Complainant on the request of the Panelist, inviting the Complainant to submit any additional information by 10 December 2025. The Complainant sought an extension in the submission until 24 December 2025 which was subsequently granted. The Complainant submitted a rejoinder on 22 December 2025.

The Panelist completed the review and issued a decision on 01 January 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 05 January 2025.

Applying Paragraph 4(a) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the *Rules*), DNDRC appointed Mr. Willayat Ali Shah 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:

8.1. Founded in in 2002, the Complainant (SpaceX or Complainant hereafter) has become the leading aerospace manufacturer, space transportation, and Communications Company worldwide.

- 8.2. *In January 2015, SpaceX publicly announced its satellite internet constellation, with the opening of the SpaceX satellite development facility in Redmond, Washington, USA. SpaceX's announcement was featured in numerous notable news and media outlets in the United States and throughout the world. Representative examples of such publications are attached hereto as Annexure - 5.*
- 8.3. *In anticipation of the release of its Starlink satellite telecommunication services, SpaceX filed a US trademark application for the STARLINK trademark on August 21, 2017.*
- 8.4. *In February 2018, SpaceX launched its first Starlink internet satellites from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California, USA. The launch was widely covered and prominently featured in numerous publications throughout the world. Representative examples of such publications are attached hereto as Annexure 6.*
- 8.5. *Ever since filing its initial trademark registration application in 2017 at home grounds, i.e. the USA, SpaceX has used and continues to use the trademark STARLINK prominently and exponentially in connection with its communication services in the United States and internationally, including in Pakistan. It is evident from perusal of Annexure 7 (below) that SpaceX had successfully secured intellectual property rights in its trademark STARLINK by as early as 21st August 2017 by virtue of registration in Singapore in Classes 09, 38 and 42, registration number: 40201716135P. Thus, not only does the Complainant have prior established rights than the Respondent who had the impugned domain registered on 19th March 2018, but is also a testament to the Complainant's trademark being a Well-known trademark around the globe. Complainant's trademark registrations dated or earlier than March 2018 are as follows and attached as Annexure – 7):*

Mark	Country	Registration No.	Class(es)	Protected since	Status
STARLINK	Singapore	40201716135P	9, 38, 42	21-Aug-2017	Registered
STARLINK	United Kingdom	3251512	9, 38, 42	22-Dec-2017	Registered
STARLINK	Hong Kong	304247361	9, 38, 42	16-Mar-2018	Registered
STARLINK	Tonga	02802	9, 38, 42	22-Mar-2018	Registered

- 8.6. *As a pioneer in the aerospace, telecommunication industries and space transportation, SpaceX has spent a great deal of effort and expense in protecting its valuable intellectual property rights, which it has gained through developing and marketing highly successful*

aerospace, communication products and services and space transportation. SpaceX has continually used the STARLINK trademark in commerce for several years and owns multiple live, distinctive, and well-known trademark registrations. Through sheer hard work, innovative ideas and extensive sales and advertising coupled with the high quality of its products and services, SpaceX has generated substantial goodwill and customer recognition in its Trademark - STARLINK, as is also evident from the local and international registrations mentioned in Section 7 above – collectively referred to as the “STARLINK trademarks”.

- 8.7. SpaceX maintains a website at <http://www.starlink.com/>. See Complainant’s website, a true and correct screenshot of which is provided as Annexure – 8.*
- 8.8. That SpaceX through its operations under the brand name STARLINK, coupled with extensive sales and advertising along with high quality products and services has garnered immense goodwill and customer recognition which in itself highlights the popularity of the SpaceX’s goods and services offered under the Complainant’s – STARLINK- marks and logos among the general public and customers.*
- 8.9. That the Complainant has registered domain names incorporating its well-known and registered STARLINK trademarks, including its long-standing domain name starlink.com. The Complainant uses its starlink.com domain name to conduct business transaction, including with its customers, interact with customers, announce offers and provide information on its goods and services.*
- 8.10. That Respondent created the domain name <https://starlink.pk>. The WHOIS search result for <https://starlink.pk> from PKNIC WHOIS Service lists PKNIC as the registrant.*
- 8.11. That the Respondent registered the domain name <https://starlink.pk> in violation of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“the Policy”) and the Rules thereto (“the Rules”) and in bad faith imitating the look and feel, and color scheme and trademarks, of the Complainant’s website <http://www.starlink.com/>.*
- 8.12. Moreover, Respondent is engaged in trademark infringement of the Complainant’s well-known, locally and internationally registered trademark by using the name “Starlink” on its offending website, which substantially copies the Complainant’s trademarks of STARLINK. Therefore, Respondent’s use and branding of “Starlink” is substantially misleading to the general public in Pakistan, who may most likely confuse the origin of or affiliate Respondent’s website with that of the Complainant’s.*

- 8.13. Furthermore, Respondent is also engaged in unfair competition by registering and operating the offending domain name by copying/imitating the identical and/or confusingly similar STALINK trademarks on its webpage. That the Respondent is also engaged in bad faith copying and imitation of Complainant's trademarks, which is evident from its post on X (former Twitter) tagging Mr. Elon Musk informing him of his offending domain registration/ownership and inadvertently offering to sell it, hence acting as a domain squatter, which in itself is a testament to Respondent's infringement activities and utter disrespect of law and good business practices. The Respondent's post also signifies that its domain name and its subsequent registration was not a novelty of its mind, but in fact Respondent was well aware of the existence of the Complainant's website, trademark and its associated goodwill, well-known status and brand recognition amongst consumers in general.
- 8.14. That the impugned domain (<https://starlink.pk>) is: (1) in part identical with or similar to an earlier trade mark and domain name of the Complainant (<http://www.starlink.com/>); and (2) the use of such impugned domain would (without due cause) take unfair advantage of, or be detrimental to, the distinctive character or the reputation of Complainant's well-known trademark, which is protected under the Paris Convention and Section 17(4)(a) and Section 86 of the Trade Marks Ordinance 2001. It is submitted that merely adding County Code Top Level Domain (ccTLD) ".pk" does not add distinctiveness to the disputed domain name of <https://starlink.pk> but instead creates an impression that the disputed domain name relates to the Complainant's business. Internet users will be led to believe that the disputed domain name is authorized, associated with, or belongs to the Complainant as the ccTLD ".pk" is that of the country where the Complainant has operations.

Therefore, the Complainant seeks the following remedy:

In accordance with Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy, for the reasons described in the complaint above, the Complainant requests the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding to issue a decision that the disputed domain name of: <https://starlink.pk> be transferred to the Complainant

B. Respondent

The Respondent makes the following submissions:

I hereby deny the Complaint in its entirety. The allegations made by the Complainant (Space Exploration Technologies Corp.) are incorrect, misleading, and incomplete. The disputed

domain name **starlink.pk** was registered by me in **March 2018** in good faith, to support my already operating **local Internet Service Provider (ISP) business** which has been trading under the name **Starlink** since 2017/2018.

I categorically deny that the domain name was registered or used in bad faith. I also deny that I lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. On the contrary, I have continuously and legitimately used the name "Starlink" in connection with my bona fide ISP business in Pakistan, investing substantial amounts in infrastructure, billing systems, licensed software, employees, and ongoing customer service.

*The Complainant's reliance on a casual social media remark made years after my domain registration does not and cannot prove bad faith at the time of registration. Moreover, the Complainant obtained its **Pakistan trademark only in March 2020**, nearly **two years after** my registration of the domain.*

Therefore, I deny the Complaint in full and request dismissal of the claims.

The Respondent seeks the following remedy:

In light of the facts and evidence presented above, I respectfully request the following remedies:

- *That the Complaint filed by the Complainant be dismissed in its entirety.*
- *That the Respondent (myself) be allowed to retain ownership and continued use of the domain name starlink.pk, as it is integral to the legitimate operation of my ISP business in Pakistan.*
- *That the DNDRC confirm no transfer, cancellation, or modification of the disputed domain is warranted.*

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. C2007-0001) available on the DNDRC website (http://www.dndrc.com/cases_resolved/pdf/c2007-0001.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 (2019-08-19) 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 Disputed Domain Name, 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 / trade mark?
- 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?

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

Mark	Country	Registration No.	Class(es)	Protected since	Status
STARLINK	Pakistan	566203	9	18-Mar-2020	Registered
STARLINK	Pakistan	566204	38	18-Mar-2020	Registered

(Copies of Complainant's trademark registrations in Pakistan are attached as Annexure – 3).

Mark	Country	Registration No.	Class(es)	Protected since	Status
STARLINK	Andorra	42862	9, 38, 42	19-Jul-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Anguilla	6583	9, 38, 42	17-Aug-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Albania	22464	9, 38, 42	19-Jan-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Hong Kong	304247361	9, 38, 42	16-Mar-2018	Registered
STARLINK	Iceland	V0122285	9, 38, 42	15-Jun-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Israel	326135	9, 38, 42	02-Sep-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Jamaica	82876	9, 38, 42	11-Mar-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Kazakhstan	75496	9, 38, 42	15-Oct-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Kosovo	29811	9, 38, 42	30-Sep-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Kyrgyz Republic	17962	9, 38, 42	11-Mar-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Laos	51639	9, 38, 42	25-Aug-2021	Registered
STARLINK	North Macedonia	30052	9, 38, 42	24-Sep-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Mauritius	31141/2021	9, 38, 42	20-Dec-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Montserrat	5170	9, 38, 42	02-Sep-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Montenegro	15782	9, 38, 42	23-Feb-2022	Registered

STARLINK	Monaco	21.00502	9, 38, 42	31-Oct-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Morocco	214311	9, 38, 42	15-Mar-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Panama	280396-01	9, 38, 42	19-Mar-2020	Registered
STARLINK	Peru	27776	9, 38, 42	15-Oct-2020	Registered
STARLINK	Philippines	503596	9, 38, 42	20-Nov-2020	Registered
STARLINK	Rwanda	RW/T/2021/28 6	9, 38, 42	23-Aug-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Serbia	81808	9, 38, 42	31-Dec-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Singapore	40201716135P	9, 38, 42	21-Aug-2017	Registered
STARLINK	Armenia	33850	9, 38, 42	29-Nov-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Aruba	36641	9, 38, 42	03-Nov-2021	Registered
STARLINK	St. Maarten	16456	9, 38, 42	19-Aug-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Korea, Republic of	401373446	9, 38, 42	29-Jun-2018	Registered
STARLINK	Switzerland	715734	9, 38, 42	30-Apr-2018	Registered
STARLINK	Tonga	02802	9, 38, 42	22-Mar-2018	Registered
STARLINK	Uzbekistan	MGU 43463	9, 38, 42	27-Dec-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Turkmenistan	17801	9, 38, 42	13-Jun-2022	Registered
STARLINK	United Kingdom	3251512	9, 38, 42	22-Dec-2017	Registered
STARLINK	Uruguay	501031	9, 38, 42	05-Dec-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Virgin Islands (British)	8870	9, 38, 42	23-Aug-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Azerbaijan	2022 0247	9, 38, 42	24-Jan-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Belarus	73956	9, 38, 42	23-May-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Belize	16901.21	9, 38, 42	12-Aug-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Caribbean Netherlands(Bo naire, St Eustatius, Saba)	7206	9, 38, 42	10-Aug-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Bhutan	BT/T/2021/99 47	9, 38, 42	13-Jul-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Bosnia and Herzegovina	BAZ2123244	9, 38, 42	29-Jun-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Chile	1288818	9, 38, 42	02-Jan-2019	Registered
STARLINK	Costa Rica	298023	9, 38, 42	23-Jul-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Curacao	20066	9, 38, 42	29-Sep-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Denmark	VR 2022 00683	9, 38, 42	26-Mar-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Dominican Republic	277799	9, 38, 42	01-Jun-2021	Registered
STARLINK	European Union (Community)	17133621	9, 38, 42	15-May-2018	Registered
STARLINK	France	21/4809925	9, 38, 42	19-Oct-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Georgia	M35088	9, 38, 42	18-Feb-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Grenada	169/2021	9, 38, 42	17-Jan-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Guernsey	GGGT9354	9, 38, 42	21-Oct-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Guyana	31041	9, 38, 42	28-Jun-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Tuvalu	1841	9, 38, 42	30-Mar-2022	Registered
STARLINK	United Kingdom	UK009171336 21	9, 38, 42	15-May-2018	Registered
STARLINK	Djibouti	DJ/M/2021/27 7	9, 38, 42	04-Nov-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Mongolia	40-0025401	9, 38, 42	30-May-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Argentina	2984715	038	07-May-2019	Registered

STARLINK	Macau	N / 185083 (807)	038	10-Feb-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Malaysia	TM202000569 9	038	18-Mar-2020	Registered
STARLINK	Mozambique	43719/2021	038	14-Jan-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Papua New Guinea	79052	038	30-Jun-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Paraguay	553.610	038	03-Nov-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Seychelles	16031	038	17-Jan-2022	Registered
STARLINK	United States of America	6,329,193	038	20-Apr-2021	Registered
STARLINK	South Africa	2018/37149	038	06-Jul-2020	Registered
STARLINK	Turks and Caicos Islands	20623	038	12-Aug-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Bahrain	133464	038	10-Jan-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Bolivia	194614-C	038	21-Sep-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Brazil	914481614	038	02-Apr-2019	Registered
STARLINK	China (People's Republic)	25983866	038	14-Mar-2019	Registered
STARLINK	Colombia	680103	038	04-Jun-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Ecuador	2021-12865	038	28-Sep-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Guatemala	263994	038	07-Dec-2021	Registered
STARLINK	Honduras	2022-29512	038	16-Mar-2022	Registered
STARLINK	Kiribati	4291	038	09-Jun-2022	Registered
STARLINK	India	3617091	038, 042	11-Apr-2018	Registered
STARLINK	Japan	6038641	038, 042	27-Apr-2018	Registered
STARLINK	Taiwan	1907911	038, 042	01-Apr-2018	Registered

(Copies of Complainant's worldwide trademark registrations are attached as Annexure – 4)

The Respondent has not made any submissions.

For the purposes of assessment of illegality, it is crucial for the Complainant to prove that the DDN exclusively contravenes their trademark rights. For that, the Complainant has demonstrated their trademark registrations for the word “STARLINK” in numerous jurisdictions including in Pakistan since 2020 in classes 9 and 38.

The PKNIC policy, under Paragraph 1(1) expressly prohibits the registration of a domain name that infringes upon a registered tradename. Since the Complainant has sufficiently satisfied their trademark rights with respect to “STARLINK”, an exact reiteration of which is used in the DDN, without any additions or modifications, whatsoever, the Respondent has unlawfully used the same to register the DDN which this makes the DDN void ab initio in accordance with the PKNIC policy (See *Standard Chartered PLC v. Hosting Campus Domain* (case no. C2007-0001)).

In light of the submissions made, the Panel deems the DDN to be in infringement of Complainant's trademark and the PKNIC's policy.

However, for the sake of arguments, the Panel still finds it necessary to assess and evaluate the remaining UDRP criteria.

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

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

- 1. That it is obvious from the perusal of the above paragraphs and the attached and collectively marked Annexures to this Complaint that the Complainant, SpaceX, owns various trademark registrations for - STARLINK. These registrations constitute prima facie evidence of the validity of the mark. Thus, the Complainant has satisfied its onus of showing that it has rights in these trademarks.*
- 2. That it is an ironic fact that the domain name in question is being used by the Respondent despite the Complainant being the true and legitimate owner of registered trademarks, which have been incorporated into the impugned domain name. That the domain name of <https://starlink.pk> is identical with and confusingly similar to the trademarks of the Complainant as the words in the Complainant's trademarks – STAR LINK – as also reflected on its goods and services have been incorporated in the impugned domain name, which evidently creates a likelihood of confusion among the general public. [See Viacom International Inc. v Emperor Sedusa WIPO Case No. D2001-1438 where the domain names <mtvasia.net> was held to be confusingly similar to the complainant's trademark MTV; also see PepsiCo, Inc. v. Kieran McGarry WIPO Case No. D2005-0629 where the domain names <pepsiusa.com> was held to be confusingly similar to the complainant's trademark Pepsi; also see WalMart Stores, Inc. v. Lars Stork WIPO Case No. D2000-0628 where the domain names <wal-marteurope.com> was held to be confusingly similar to the complainant's trademark Wal-Mart]; also see WhatsApp Inc. v. Meraart DNDRC Case No. C2017-0001 where the domain name <whatsapp.pk> was held to be identical and confusingly similar to the complainant's trademark WHATSAPP.*
- 3. Similarly, in Zameen Media (Private) Limited v Rashed Saeed Saif Aleter Aldhanhani, WIPO Case No. DAE2021-0002, the domain name <zameen.ae> was held to be confusingly similar to the complainants' trademark and domain name (ZAMEEN). It was further established*

that for the purposes of comparison the ccTLD “.ae” is to be disregarded and the term “zameen” is to be compared with the trademark of the complainant - “ZAMEEN”.

- 4. Likewise, more recently in JanitorAI Inc. v Danny Long WIPO Case No. DME2024-0004, the “.me” country code Top-Level Domain (ccTLD) was explicitly disregarded in the comparison when determining identical or confusingly similar traits. The Panel determined that ccTLDs, like gTLDs, are typically excluded from the comparison, as they are viewed as standard technical registration requirements not forming part of a trademark, therefore the ‘.pk’ country code must not be considered when comparing the term “Starlink” with the Complainant’s trademark – “STARLINK”.*
- 5. Similarly, in Monster Energy Company v. Theodore Idleburg WIPO Case No. D2016-1869, the panel explicitly determined that the only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s MUSCLE MONSTER mark was the “.xyz” Top Level Domain (TLD) and that the selection of TLD is irrelevant to a determination of identical or confusingly similar.*
- 6. Thus, SpaceX, being the Complainant, has satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a) (i) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has made the following submissions:

The word “Starlink” is not exclusive to the Complainant in Pakistan.

Several local companies are registered under the same or similar names, showing widespread independent usage.

For example, STARLINK DIGITAL CABLE TV NETWORK (PRIVATE) LIMITED was incorporated on 06 December 2018 under SECP Faisalabad, after my domain registration.

Annexure 11 – SECP company name search result showing multiple entities with “Starlink” in their names.

The Panel has reviewed the submissions of the Parties:

The Complainant has contended that the DDN is identical and confusingly similar to their registered trademark “STARLINK” whereas the Respondent contends that the word

“STARLINK” is not exclusive to the Complainant, being generic, and are used as a name by other companies registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan.

For the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity, the generic Country Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) “.pk” is disregarded as this is a technical requirement of registration (See *Zameen Media (Private) Limited v Rashed Saeed Saif Aleter Aldhanhani, WIPO Case No. DAE2021-0002*).

The Panel refers to WIPO Overview 3.0 and finds that the test for confusing similarity entails a side by side comparison of the DDN with the registered trademark of the Complainant. If the registered trademark is recognizable within the DDN, the DDN is considered to be confusingly similar to the said trademark (See Section 1.7 of WIPO Overview 3.0). In the present scenario, the DDN constitutes the entirety of the registered trademark of the Complainant, without any alterations, therefore, the DDN shall be considered identical to the Complainant’s mark.

Additionally, the Panel does not agree with the Respondent that existing company names within the SECP would avoid the finding of confusing similarity between the DDN and the registered trademark of the Complainant. The Panel notes that the existing names of the companies and the registration thereof are separate from the ambit of domain registration, which considers the trademark rights as paramount. This is also addressed by the Complainant in their rejoinder as below:

The existence of third-party infringers does not negate the identity between the Respondent’s domain and the Complainant’s registered mark. As noted in Viacom International Inc. v Emperor Sedusa (WIPO Case No. D2001-1438), the panel focuses on the confusing similarity between the Complainant’s mark and the Respondent’s domain, not the broader market conditions.

The Panel has also reviewed the submission and agrees with it, to the extent of third-party infringement not affecting the finding of identicalness between the DDN and Complainant’s trademark. Although the case law cited reinforces and focuses on the test of confusing similarity, it does not address the current situation of the Respondent relying on third party registrations to justify their own registration of the DDN.

Based on the assessment above, the Panel concludes that the DDN is identical to a trademark in which the Complainant holds rights.

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:

- 1. That the Respondent has no legitimate interest in holding on to/ operating or owning the impugned domain name in any capacity whatsoever, more specifically there is no legitimate interest when the Respondent copies, imitates web site design, lay out, color schemes, trademarks and the purpose for the website. [See Diamond Mattress Company, Inc. v. Diamond Mattress WIPO Case No. D2010-1637 where it was held that the Respondent lacked legitimate interest, because it was not a distributor but was trying to use the domain to attract commercial offerings; Similarly, see Birkenstock Orthopädie GmbH & Co. KG v. JL Innoways Co. Ltd., Jihao Jiang WIPO Case No. D2012- 1202 where it was held that the Respondent lacked legitimate interest, because it was not an authorized distributor even when it was trying to sell genuine goods.*
- 2. Moreover, the UDRP panel in Google Inc. v. Shaheen Younas, WIPO Case No. D2012-1365 held that the Respondent had no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name <youtubeurdu.com> because the panel found it inconceivable that the Respondent could not have been well aware of the Complainant's YouTube website. Similarly, in Comerica Bank v. Online Management / Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, WIPO Case No.*

D2014- 1018, where it was held the Respondent lacked legitimate interest because the Complainant had not authorized Respondent to the use of its trademarks and because of the Complainant's extensive use of its COMERICA trademarks. Additionally, in Deutsche Telekom AG v. 石磊 (Shilei) WIPO Case No. D2021-2819 the panel determined that the respondent had no affiliation, authorization, or license to use the T-MOBILE trademark and its use of the domains for PPC links or illegal data phishing was deemed not to constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

3. *In the light of the above, it is clear that Respondent intends to illegally use Complainant's trademark rights and take illicit advantage of the goodwill associated with the mark STARLINK for its own commercial gain, therefore, Respondent's website <https://starlink.pk> does not constitute a bona fide commercial venture and is actually an attempt to earn a quick buck for itself by piggybacking on the fame, goodwill and global recognition of the Complainant's trademarks.*
4. *That it is a settled UDRP jurisprudence that mere registration of a domain name is not sufficient to confer rights or legitimate interests. That it is also obvious from the perusal of the above paragraphs that by registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent intends to take unfair advantage by causing confusion to general public, with respect to origin or purpose of the Complainant's trademarks.*
5. *Furthermore, Respondent's intent to register the impugned domain is also evident from its post on 'X' (Former Twitter) wherein the Respondent tags Mr. Elon Musk, Complainant's Founder and CEO, and offers to sell the impugned domain to him. The post illustrates Respondent's intention to earn a quick buck by domain squatting/passive holding and reflects that Respondent has no other actual or bona fide purpose for such domain name registration.*
6. *That it is also the settled UDRP jurisprudence that once the complainant has put forth an initial showing that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to allege specific rights establishing its rights or legitimate interests, and in case of failure to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4 (a) (ii) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has made the following submissions:

I have been operating a legitimate ISP business under the name Starlink since 2017/2018, before registering the disputed domain starlink.pk in March 2018.

Our business has continuously used this name for providing internet and cable services. Evidence includes printed pamphlets, customer fee books, and promotional material are attached as annexure 3.

We also created official social media pages in March 2018, which remain active:

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/starlink.pk>

Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/starlink.pk>

And screenshots attached as annexure 4.

Additionally, a Google My Business listing exists for our office (screenshot attached as annexure 5). <https://maps.app.goo.gl/cUGMBsuqhtodijl76>

I have invested significantly in ISP infrastructure and customer management systems.

Over time, I used SAS Radius, later upgrading to ZalPro ISP CRM (subscribed 7 August 2020, valid until 7 February 2026, with 10,000 subscriber limit). Screenshot attached as annexure 8.

I have also subscribed to and paid for:

- SmartOLT licenses to manage hardware. (Proof attached as annexure 9)*
- BNG license for advanced ISP functionality. (Proof attached as annexure 10)*

The Panel has reviewed the submissions of the Parties.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no legitimate rights or interest in the DDN due to the Respondent being aware of the trademark as well as using it to illicitly take advantage of the goodwill associated with it whereas the Respondent claims that they have been using the name “Starlink” since 2017, providing evidence of their social media handles and commercial invoices.

The Panel initially notes that the Complainant, by contending that the Respondent lacks any legitimate interest in the DDN and was not offering any bona fide services, shifted the burden of proof to the Respondent to prove that they have a legitimate interest in the DDN.

In accordance with the Policy, the Respondent has to prove one of the three circumstances laid under Paragraph 4(c) to demonstrate their legitimate interests in the DDN. The Panel would evaluate each of them separately.

The Panel assesses the contention of the Respondent regarding the operations beginning in 2017. The Panel notes, as highlighted in the rejoinder submitted by the Complainant, that the Complainant had publicly announced the name “STARLINK” in 2015 which would provide internet connectivity via satellite, effectively predating the use of the name “STARLINK” compared to the Respondent by 2 years. It is also demonstrated that the DDN was acquired one month after the renowned launch of Starlink satellites. Therefore, it seems highly likely that the Respondent was aware of the mark and registered the DDN in furtherance of the announcement to take advantage of the goodwill of the Complainant as the Respondent has not addressed the same in their contentions (See *Google Inc. v. Shaheen Younas*, WIPO Case No. D2012-1365).

Additionally, the Complainant had specifically addressed the Respondent not falling under the Oki Data criteria as below:

Even if the Respondent claims to be an independent reseller or service provider (e.g., claiming affiliation with "National Broadband" or "Login.me" as per Exhibit L), he fails the test established in the seminal case of Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc. (WIPO Case No. D2001-0903). The Oki Data test requires, among other things, that the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark owner.

- *Violation: The Respondent's website displays the name "Starlink" prominently. It uses a "Swoosh" logo that mimics aerospace themes. Crucially, there is no disclaimer stating that the Respondent is not affiliated with SpaceX.*
- *Impersonation: By operating an ISP (the exact service SpaceX provides) under the name "Starlink," the Respondent is actively impersonating the Complainant. This creates "initial interest confusion" where customers looking for SpaceX's satellite service land on the Respondent's page and sign up for his cable service, mistakenly believing it to be the famous global brand.*
- *Case Law: In Amegy Bank National Association v. Contact Privacy Inc. (WIPO Case No. D2014-0983), the Panel held that similarity in services offered by the Respondent to those of the Complainant supports a finding of lack of legitimate interest. Similarly, in Deutsche Telekom AG v. 石磊 (Shilei) (WIPO Case No. D2021-2819), the panel found that unauthorized use of a telecom trademark (T-Mobile) for related services did not constitute legitimate use.*

The Panel, in assessing legitimate interest of Respondent under Oki Data criteria, agrees with the Complainant and finds that the Respondent has not, in any way, disclosed their relationship with the Complainant, especially in a situation where the Respondent was explicitly aware of the global recognition of the “STARLINK” mark.

The Panel further observes that the mere use of the name “STARLINK” in social media handles or Google business listings does not create or confer any rights upon the registrant or account holder, as these platforms do not require verification of the names used and can be freely registered by anyone, from anywhere. Likewise, the inclusion of the name “STARLINK” on commercial invoices does not vest any rights in the Respondent, as such documents are merely transactional in nature and do not, by themselves, establish entitlement to a trademark or trade name.

In furtherance to seek clarity on legitimate rights of the Respondent, the Panelist had requested for relevant government authorization under which the Respondent was allowed to provide internet services. However, the Respondent clarified that no such authorization was granted to them and that the services were being provided through a channel partnership and infrastructure relationship with licensed providers. It must be noted that the Respondent, in their supporting documentation, provided no proof or evidence to back their claim for this alleged “channel partnership” with the service providers. In particular, the Respondent failed to provide any indication that it has been authorized to provide internet services using the Complainant's trademark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the submission of the Respondent insufficient for the purposes of bona fide provision of services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of UDRP.

Additionally, the Complainant has provided several evidence of their trademark registrations globally however, no such definitive evidence are provided by the Respondent of the same, except for the registration of DDN, social media handles, Google listing and commercial invoices. It is noted that in accordance with Exhibit-G of the Respondent’s supporting documents, listing of the Respondent on Google shows 7 reviews which is a drastically low number for a business operating for the past 08 years. Moreover, Exhibit-K demonstrates the usage of business email which shows merely 03 emails sent, all in the month of June 2025. Accordingly, the evidences provided by the Respondent itself urges the Panel to find that the Respondent is not commonly known by the trademark “STARLINK”, negating the finding of Paragraph 4(c)(ii).

Lastly, in accordance with Paragraph 4(c)(iii), Panels have consistently found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation (See Section 2.5.1 of WIPO Overview 3.0). In accordance with Section 2.5.2 of WIPO Overview 3.0, overall facts and circumstances are to be looked at while assessing a finding under paragraph 4(c)(iii). In the current

case, the finding of identity, lack of bona fide provision of services coupled with lack of authorization from the Complainant to use their trademark would avoid the finding of fair use of the DDN (See *RealPage Utility Management Inc. v. Alan Brilliant* Case No. D2025-0317 / WIPO Case No. D2010-0138, *LEGO Juris A/S v. DomainPark Ltd*).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to satisfy the burden that was shifted upon them.

The Panel determines that the Respondent does not have any legitimate interest in the DDN.

IV. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

1. *It is imperative to note that Respondent, having prior knowledge of existence of Complainant's website and its trademarks, intentionally sought registration of the disputed domain <https://starlink.pk>. The disputed domain name reflects the registered trademarks of the Complainant which are used to promote its bona fide business and is a clear attempt by Respondent to gain undue benefits from copying identical/similar trademarks of the Complainant.*
2. *Bad faith on part of the Respondent is also established by the fact that the disputed Domain is intentionally being used in a manner designed to cause confusion between the Complainant's genuine and novel innovation of its trademarks and business and that of Respondent's domain name for the purposes of attracting Internet traffic for commercial gain, hence constituting bad faith registration and use on part of the Respondent. Not only does the Disputed Domain Name incorporate the STARLINK mark, but also mimics the domain name of Complainant's official website, starlink.com. Indeed, upon information and belief, the disputed Domain directs to a fraudulent website offering services under the STARLINK mark, to scam internet users into believing Respondent purportedly provides Complainant's goods and services based on the use of the STARLINK trademark. See Annexure - 9. The Respondent is thus falsely suggesting it is the trademark owner and its website is an official website of Complainant. The disputed domain name reflects the registered trademarks of the Complainant which are used to promote its bona fide business.*
3. *Furthermore, bad faith on part of the Respondent can be further highlighted in the light of *Amegy Bank National Association v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0136596179 / Banks Joseph*, WIPO Case No. D2014-0983, where the panel held that the Respondent had used*

the disputed domain name in bad faith due to the similarity not only in the disputed trademarks, but also, due to the similarity in the services offered by the Respondent with those of the Complainant, as was also seen in Happy Pancake AB v. Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC / Fredrik Johansson, WIPO Case No. D2014-0870, where the Panel found the Respondent to have registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith; and also in Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Amazonprime.pk DNDRC Case No. C2019-006 where the Panel found that it was unlikely that the Respondent was unaware about the Complainant's mark AMAZON and PRIME at the time of registration and use of the disputed domain name <Amazonprime.pk> especially given that the Respondent used the domain name for similar and related services as that of the Complainant.

4. *Likewise, the panel in Facebook Inc. and Instagram, LLC v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Mihael Megatron, WIPO Case No. D2019-0797, held that the Respondent had obtained registration of the disputed domain names in bad faith because his Trademarks distinctively identify the Complainants' respective Trademarks so that the choice of the Disputed Domain Names which are clearly intended to replicate the Trademarks cannot be reasonably explained otherwise than as a reference to the Trademarks respectively owned by the Complainants.*
5. *In addition to above, the panel in Gateway Inc. v. Domaincar WIPO Case No. D2006-0604 observed that the Complainant's GATEWAY trademarks appeared to have considerable renown attaching to them in the United States and worldwide and were long established prior to the registration by the Respondent of the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel was of the view that at the time the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent is more than likely to have been well aware of the GATEWAY trademarks.*
6. *In the light of the above, considering the Well-Known status of the Complainant's registered trademark - STARLINK and its international registrations as early as 2017, it is highly unlikely that Respondent had no prior knowledge/awareness of Complainant's trademarks, the goodwill and fame associated with it, when registering the impugned domain in 2018, especially when both belong to the same industry, the nature of goods and services offered are the same, i.e. internet services. Having the impugned domain registered under a country code ".pk" does not negate bad faith registration on part of the Respondent and does not amount to a bona fide registration either, as is evident from the Respondent's post on X (formerly twitter) to Mr. Elon Musk, which in itself is testament to Respondent acting in bad faith for being aware of the Complainant's trademarks and website, as he offers Mr. Musk his impugned domain for sale, rent or transfer of ownership. Annexure-2 is reiterated*

7. *Bad faith on part of the respondent can be established on multiple grounds, which being; having knowledge of complainant's trademark and website prior to registering the impugned domain. The term Starlink is a novel innovation of the Complainant and is not a common or generally used term of vocabulary. Belonging to the same industry, i.e. provision of internet services makes it even more unlikely for Respondent not to have known of Complainant's business and its Well-Known trademarks, hence bad faith on part of the Respondent is not limited to registering the impugned domain with an identical or confusingly similar trademark STARLINK, but also extends to Respondent's intent to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's site. Moreover, Respondent's post to Mr. Elon Musk, attached as Annexure-2, prima facie establishes cyber-squatting with an intent to sell, rent or transfer ownership of the impugned domain.*

The Respondent has made the following submissions:

The domain starlink.pk is central to my operations and not idle.

It is actively used for:

- *Customer communication via email (info@starlink.pk). Screenshot attached as annexure 6.*
- *Billing and dealer management through the subdomain bill.starlink.pk, which manages thousands of user accounts and dealer networks. Screenshot attached as annexure 7.*

Since inception, my ISP business has:

- *Employed staff,*
- *Served thousands of customers, and*
- *Provided reliable internet services under the Starlink name.*

All operations, including billing, communication, and technical systems, are continuously maintained and funded solely for running this business. Screenshots as annexure 12.

The Panel has reviewed the submissions of the Parties:

To satisfy this criterion, the Complainant is required to prove both that the DDN was registered in bad faith and used in bad faith. For this purpose, the Complainant contends that the Respondent

seeks to capitalize on the trademark and popularity of the Complainant, and that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark while using it to mislead customer onto his website by providing identical services.

The Respondent argues that the DDN is being actively used to provide genuine services to the customers, attaching evidences of customer correspondences and billing system integrated to the DDN.

The Panel notes that the Complainant's mark "STARLINK" is a distinctive and well-known mark, used internationally and registered as early as 2017. The Respondent registered the DDN in 2018 after the Complainant's mark had gained significant recognition globally, including in the field of satellite-based internet services. Considering that both parties purport to operate in the same industry, it is improbable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's existence and rights in the "STARLINK" mark at the time of registration, therefore, suggesting bad faith on the part of Respondent (See Section 3.2.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.0). Panels have also consistently held that merely registering a domain name identical to a famous trademark can create a presumption of bad faith (See Section 3.1.4 of WIPO Overview 3.0).

Additionally, the Panel notes the case of *Amegy Bank National Association v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0136596179 / Banks Joseph, WIPO Case No. D2014-0983* as cited by the Complainant and finds that the deliberate choice of an identical mark, coupled with the service offering, supports an inference that the DDN was registered with knowledge of and intent to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation. It has been held that use of a complainant's well-known mark in connection with identical goods or services constitutes bad faith, as it seeks to exploit the reputation and attract users through confusion (see *Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Amazonprime.pk, DNDRC Case No. C2019-006*).

The Complainant has also provided evidence (Annexure 2) showing that the Respondent contacted Mr. Elon Musk, offering the DDN for sale. Although the Respondent refers to the communication as casual, this demonstrates knowledge of the Complainant's mark on part of the Respondent and also falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, which identifies the registration of a domain primarily for the purpose of selling it to the trademark owner or a competitor as an indication of bad faith.

Additionally, the lack of disclaimers by the Respondent on the website regarding the "STARLINK" mark, despite being aware of the its global recognition and influence, is also demonstrative of the intention to mislead customers into believing that they were dealing with the actual owner of the trademark (See Section 3.7 of WIPO Overview 3.0)

The Panel also notes the insufficient evidence provided by the Respondent, as also noted by the Complainant below:

Exhibit ID	Respondent's Claim	Document Date	Forensic Observation & Implication
Ex. A	"Significant Financial Investment" (SmartOLT)	July 25, 2025	The invoice is for a 3-month license starting July 29, 2025. This illustrates investment <i>after</i> the dispute arose or was anticipated, not at the time of registration in 2018. It is a retroactive attempt to create a paper trail.
Ex. B	"Advanced ISP Functionality" (BNG License)	August 05, 2025	Similar to Ex. A, this invoice is dated mere months before this Response. It proves zero activity for the years 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024.
Ex. E	"ZalPro ISP CRM" Subscription	August 07, 2020	The start date is 2.5 years <i>after</i> the domain registration (March 2018) and well <i>after</i> SpaceX's Starlink had achieved global fame. It suggests a pivot to the name only after the brand became valuable.
Annex 3	"Pamphlets & Fee Books"	Undated	These are self-generated documents. Anyone can print a flyer at a local shop for negligible cost. Without a printer's invoice or distribution receipt from 2018, their evidentiary weight is nil.
Annex 4	"Facebook Page Creation"	March 18, 2018	The screenshot shows creation date but conceals the "Page Name History." It is common for squatters to buy old pages and rename them. The Respondent failed to show the page was <i>named</i> "Starlink" in 2018.
Annex 5	"Google My Business"	Undated Reviews	The listing has only 7 reviews. For an ISP claiming to serve "thousands of customers" over 7 years, this paucity of engagement suggests a shell entity or a recently created listing.

Assessing the evidence submitted by the Respondent in their supporting documentation, it is deduced that the evidence provided are not sufficient to establish business arrangement dating back before the registration of Complainant's trademark or related announcement of such. On the contrary, the evidence only suggest that the Respondent had began to invest in the business as late as in Q3 of 2025 which is significantly later than the global fame of the Complainant. This is also substantiated by the customer correspondence provided by the Respondent themselves in Annexure-6, demonstrating only 3 emails, with all of them dated 21 June 2025. This suggests that the timing and circumstances of the registration of DDN was strictly contingent upon the announcement by the Complainant, with the Respondent being proactive regarding investment only in 2025, after the Complainant had achieved global fame (See Section 3.2.1 of WIPO Overview 3.0).

In light of these factors including (i) prior knowledge of the Complainant's well-known mark, (ii) use of the domain for identical commercial services, (iii) apparent offer to sell the domain to the trademark owner and (iv) lack of evidence of bona fide business activity prior to the Complainant's global recognition, the Panel finds that the DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

7. Decision

The Panel, upon the review of the submissions made by the Parties, recognizes that the "STARLINK" marks are 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 Respondent's registration of the DDN violates the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19);
2. The DDN is identical 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 domain name in dispute <starlink.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: Mr Willayat Ali Shah

Sole Panelist

Date: 01 January 2025