

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0001

Also in PDF C2026-0001

1. The Complainant

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

2. The Domain Name and Respondent

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

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by Bravo with the contact name Zahida Perveen, with their address at Mehmood Kot PO Khas Muzaffar Garh Muzaffar Garh, Mehmood Kot and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is kashanzafar888@gmail.com.

3. Procedural History

DNDRC was informed of the Complaint against the Respondent in accordance with the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy upon receiving notification from the Complainant on 14 November 2025. An administrative review of the Complaint was conducted and completed on 24 November 2025, following which the Complainant was notified of the compliance review's completion and the subsequent procedural requirements.

Upon the Complainant's fulfillment of the procedural requirements on 24 November 2025, DNDRC formally requested the Respondent's registration details from PKNIC on 27 November 2025. PKNIC provided the requested details on 29 November 2025.

DNDRC issued a formal notification of the dispute to the Respondent on 01 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 material was referred to the appointed arbitrator for review and decision on 22 December 2025. The arbitrator completed the review and issued a decision on 02 January 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 02 January 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

- 1. The Complainant, WhatsApp, LLC (WhatsApp) is a provider of one of the world's most popular mobile messaging applications (or apps). Founded in 2009 and acquired by Meta Platforms, Inc. (formerly Facebook, Inc.) (Meta) in 2014, WhatsApp allows users across the globe to exchange messages for free via smartphones, including iPhone and Android. Its main website available at www.whatsapp.com also allows Internet users to access its messaging platform.*
- 2. Since its launch in 2009, WhatsApp has become one of the fastest growing and most popular mobile applications in the world, with over 2.95 billion monthly active users worldwide in June 2024.² WhatsApp has acquired considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide, including in Pakistan. WhatsApp is the 1st most downloaded application in Pakistan and 4th in the world.*

Screen captures of the Complainant's website and copies of information on the Complainant, including its Wikipedia entry, press articles on Meta's acquisition of WhatsApp, its

application ranking and rapid growth and popularity worldwide, including in Pakistan, are provided as **Annex 4**.

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

Copies of the WhoIs records for selected domain names comprising the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark are provided as **Annex 5**.

The Domain Names and the Respondent's websites

4. Until on or around 28 July 2025, the Domain Name resolved to a website (the **Respondent's website**) which promoted and offered for download a modified APK version of WhatsApp.
5. The Respondent's website featured the following wording:

"WhatsApp Gold is a new and upgraded version of the original WhatsApp. WhatsApp Gold Download APK has all the features of the original WhatsApp, but WhatsApp Gold has more extra features than the original WhatsApp that the developer adds."

6. In addition, the Respondent's website prominently displayed the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark and featured logos that were similar to the Complainant's figurative trademark, as follows:

The logos featured on the Respondent's website



The Complainant's WhatsApp logo



7. The Respondent's website featured no disclaimer as to its lack of relationship with the Complainant.
8. As at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolves to an inactive website.

*A screen capture of the inactive website to which the Domain Name currently resolves is provided as **Annex 7**.*

9. *On 13 May 2025, the Complainant's lawyers sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent via email. In this letter, the Complainant asserted its trademark rights and requested transfer of the Domain Name. No response was received.*

*A copy of the cease and desist letter sent by the Complainant's lawyers is provided as **Annex 8**.*

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

(b) Respondent

The Respondent did not make a submission.

5. Jurisdiction

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

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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:

- a. *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)*

- b. *Identical or confusing similarity to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (a UDRP criteria)*
- c. *Legitimate interest in Domain Name (a UDRP criteria)*
- d. *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 DN, the application and registration of the DN 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 contravene the Pakistan Penal Code, 1860 (the "Penal Code") or any applicable criminal law?

The Complainant has submitted the following:

This Complaint is based on the following trade mark registrations:

- i. *Pakistani Trademark Registration No. 302143, WHATSAPP, registered on 27 May 2011;*
- ii. *United States Trademark Registration No. 3939463, WHATSAPP, registered on 5 April 2011;*
- iii. *European Union Trade Mark No. 009986514, WHATSAPP, registered on 25 October 2011; and;*
- iv. *International Registration No. 1109890, , registered on 10 January 2012.*

*Copies of the abovementioned trade marks are provided as **Annex 3**.*

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

The Panel deduces that the Complainant has established registered trademark rights; however, a finding of illegality would require evidence that the DDN infringes upon those rights. While the DDN incorporates the entire trademark in it, the Complainant has not advanced any submissions addressing whether the suffix of "gold", among another in the DDN, prevent or diminish a finding of infringement or illegality.

In the absence of such contentions, the Panel does not find sufficient basis to conclude illegality and therefore proceeds to assess the Complaint under the three cumulative criteria set forth in the UDRP.

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

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

11. *The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to establish first, that it has rights in a trademark or service mark, and secondly, that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark or service mark.*
12. *The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for WHATSAPP in jurisdictions throughout the world, including in Pakistan (see **Annex 3**). The Complainant has therefore established trademark rights in WHATSAPP for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.*
13. *The Domain Name comprises the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark in its entirety, followed by the term "gold", under the ccTLD ".pk".*
14. *As stated in WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("**WIPO Overview 3.0**"), section 1.8:*

"Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements."
15. *The Complainant submits that the mere addition of the term "gold" in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, which remains recognizable in the Domain Name. See WhatsApp LLC v. Shoaib Ahmed, WIPO Case No. D2024-3008 (<whatsappplus.app> et al).*

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

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

The Complainant has established that it possess a registered trademark for WhatsApp and resultantly, all the relevant rights attached with said trademark/ trade name as well. Contending further, the Complainant states that its certified and globally recognized mark of the WhatsApp trademark has been copied fully by the Respondent and incorporated in the DDN.

Further, adding that the incorporation of the term “gold” cannot prevent such a finding, and the same can be said for; “.pk” which is a ccTLD, and necessary for the creation and registration of domain names, worldwide.

According to Section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview, such terms are held as; “descriptive” and “meaningless” while trying to find confusing similarity between two domain names. Secondly, the ccTLD of “.pk” will be disregarded for consideration under the test mentioned above due to its essential nature.

The Panel therefore, finds the DDN to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

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\(a\)\(ii\)](#).”

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

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

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

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

20. *As a preliminary matter, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is unable to be viewed as a bona fide service provider, as it is not providing sales or repairs in relation to a product provided by the Complainant. Rather, the Respondent was making unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademarks to promote a third-party modified version of WhatsApp. Nevertheless, even if one is to apply the Oki Data criteria, the Respondent fails to fulfil the first and third Oki Data criteria, specifically:*

(i) the Respondent's website purported to offer for download a third-party unauthorized version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application. As such, the Respondent cannot be said to have been using the Respondent's website to offer the goods or services at issue, namely the WhatsApp application.

(iii) the Respondent's website failed to accurately and prominently disclose its relationship with the Complainant given that it featured no clear disclaimer as to the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

21. *The Complainant is committed to maintaining the integrity of its WhatsApp service and does not support such third-party applications. As such, the Respondent was making unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Name and on the Respondent's website to offer services that violated the Complainant's Terms of Service. Such use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services. See WhatsApp, Inc. v. Nasser Bahaj, WIPO Case No. D2016-0581 (<ogwhatsapp.org> et al.). See also WhatsApp LLC v Younus Waqar, DNDRC Case No. 2024-0009 (<gbwhatsapp.pk>).*

22. *Furthermore, the current non-use of the Domain Name in connection with an active website does not qualify as use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods*

or services. See *Instagram, LLC v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy LLC*/ sezer suat, WIPO Case No. D2022 0157 (<Instagramloginverification.com>).

23. The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent is not using the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Names

24. The registrant information for the Domain Name is redacted in the publicly-available WhoIs record (see **Annex 2**). Apart from the email address kashanhashmi52@gmail.com, the Respondent's website did not display any contact information. Therefore, the identity of the Domain Name owner is unknown.
25. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, there is no evidence of the Respondent having obtained or applied for any trademark registration or similar right for "whatsapp" or "whatsappgold", as reflected in the Domain Name.
26. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name to promote an unauthorized WhatsApp APK does not support any reasonable claim of being commonly known by the Domain Name, nor does it give rise to any reputation in the Domain Name itself, independent of the Complainant's trademark rights.
27. The Respondent therefore cannot legitimately claim that it is commonly known by the Domain Name, in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

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

28. Nor is the Respondent currently making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy..
29. The Respondent's prior use of the Domain Name to purport to offer for download an unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application does not amount to legitimate noncommercial or fair use. See *WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Ramzan*, WIPO Case No. D2025-0340 (<gbwhatsapp-lite.com>) and DNDRC Case No. C2024-0006 (<gbwhatsapp.org.pk>).

30. *The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's current non-use of the Domain Name in connection with an active website likewise supports neither a finding of legitimate noncommercial or fair use; see Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America v. Wreaks Communications Group, WIPO Case No. D2006-0483 (<tiaa-cref.net>).*
31. *The Complainant submits that in light of the above factors, it has established a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Accordingly, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with evidence to rebut the Complainant's case. In the absence of such evidence, the Complainant may be deemed to have satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1.*

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

Following the traditional policies of the UDRP, the Panels would often have to deduce whether the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks any legitimate interest or using the DDN for commercial fair uses, although that would create a phenomena of having to; “prove a negative”. Hence the Panel would judge whether the Complainant possesses the above rights, before moving on to the Respondent who would have to prove the same.

Through registering the trademark in various jurisdictions and having internationally recognized ownership of the WhatsApp trademark along with a constant regular usage of the domain name(s) associated with the trademark, the Complainant has established, prima facie, to have legitimate interest in the DDN. (See WIPO Overview Section 1.2).

Not disregarding the fact, that the Complainant is well- known and has gathered considerable goodwill over years of incorporating the trademark in its website domain names, while the same cannot be said for the Respondent.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the DDN, since it leads to a website, which is not currently in use/ or considered as inactive. The lack of legitimate non-commercial or fair use, simply ushers the Panel to find that the Respondent lacks legitimate interest in the DDN (See *Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America v. Wreaks Communications Group, WIPO Case No. D2006- 0483*).

Considering all the above arguments, the Panel therefore deduces 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:

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

Registration in bad faith

34. *The Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark is inherently distinctive and well known throughout the world in connection with its messaging application, having been continuously and extensively used since the respective launching of its services, and acquiring considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide, including in Pakistan (see **Annex 4**).*
35. *All top results obtained by typing "WhatsApp" into the Google search engine available at www.google.com and www.google.com.pk refer to the Complainant. Copies of the Google search results are provided as **Annex 10**.*
36. *Given the Complainant's renown and goodwill worldwide and particularly its popularity and trademark rights established prior to the registration of the Domain Name, the Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark when registering the Domain Name in May 2024. See, for example, *WhatsApp Inc. v. Francisco Costa*, WIPO Case No. D2015-0909 (<webwhatsapp.com>).*
37. *Rather, the nature of the Respondent's website clearly demonstrated actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks on the part of the Respondent, as it made prominent reference to the Complainant, its WHATSAPP trademark and official application, and featured modified versions of the Complainant's WhatsApp logo and figurative trademark. These factors clearly indicate the Respondent's intent to target the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.2.1 and*

WhatsApp Inc., Facebook, Inc. v. Alex Xu, HKITN, WIPO Case No. D2019-1709, (< whatsapp-marketinghk.com> et al.).

38. *Finally, the lack of response to the Complainant's lawyers' cease and desist letter is further evidence of bad faith; See Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. v. EAO Digital Solutions, WIPO Case No. D2012-0693 (<samsungtienda.com>).*
39. *Having no relationship with the Complainant or authorization to make use of its trademark in a domain name or otherwise, the Respondent has knowingly proceeded to register the Domain Name, carrying a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, in bad faith.*

Use in bad faith

40. *Given the confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, together with the prior content of the Respondent's website, as detailed above, Internet users were likely to be misled into believing that the Respondent's website was somehow affiliated with or otherwise endorsed by the Complainant, which it was not. Prior UDRP Panels have found that the use of a domain name to mislead Internet users in such a manner constitutes evidence of bad faith; see WhatsApp Inc. v. Edwin Lizcano, Inversiones Capira SAS, WIPO Case No. D2019-1700 (<maswhatsapp.com>).*
41. *As detailed above, the Respondent's website purported to offer for download an unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application, developed by a third party. It is more likely than not that the owners of such third-party applications ultimately derived commercial advantage from the Respondent's unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Name and on its website. Prior UDRP panels have held that commercial gain may include the respondent gaining or seeking reputational and/or bargaining advantage, even where such advantage may not be readily quantified; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.3.*
42. *The Complainant therefore submits that by using the Domain Name in this fashion, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website to which the Domain Name resolved by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the application offered for download therein, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See WhatsApp, Inc. v. Whois Agent, Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc. / Mohammed Alkalbani, et al., WIPO Case No. D2016-2299 (<download-whatsapp-plus.net> et al.).*

43. *Furthermore, the promotion of an unauthorized modified APK version of the WhatsApp application not only violates the WhatsApp Terms of Service as detailed above, but also places the security of WhatsApp users at risk. The Respondent's prior use of the Domain Name to offer for download an unauthorized modified APK version of the WhatsApp application, under the Complainant's trademark disrupted the Complainant's business by driving WhatsApp users to a third-party application. Prior UDRP panels have held that such activities amount to use of a domain name in bad faith. See WhatsApp, LLC v. Adila Ayaz, Freelance, WIPO Case No. D2024-2999 (< anwhatsapp.pro> et al.).*
44. *Similarly, there was no clearly-worded disclaimer on the Respondent's website as to the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant, although even if such a disclaimer were featured on the Respondent's website, it would not have been sufficient to cure the Respondent's illegitimate use of the Domain Name; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.7. See also Instagram, LLC v. Protection of Private Person / Yurii Shemetilo / Olha Shostak, WIPO Case No. D2022-2832 (< insta-stories.online>et al.).*
45. *The Domain Name currently resolves to an inactive website (see **Annex 7**). The Complainant submits that the fact that the Domain Name no longer resolves to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith, nor does it eliminate the Respondent's prior bad faith use of the Domain Name as described in detail above. See WhatsApp LLC v. vincent lai, yh tec, WIPO No. D2024-2974 (<gbwhatsapp.dev >).*

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

Judging by the Complainant's renown and goodwill regarding its trademark and all the domain names associated with it, the Respondent "*knew or should have known*", that registering the DDN, while incorporating the trademark or trade-name of the Complainant in part or in- full, would cause the DDN to be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. Such a finding, will be considered an indication, that the Respondent registered the DDN in bad faith (See WIPO Overview 3.0 Section 3.2.2)

The DDN constitutes of the WHATSAPP trademark in its entirety; the only reasonable explanation for this can be that the Respondent aims to mislead internet users, by creating confusion regarding the source, sponsorship, endorsement or affiliation of the DDN with the Complainant and direct internet traffic to its own unauthorised website, possibly to offer other unofficial, third-party applications or tools. Prior UDRP Panels have found the above to constitute bad faith of the DDN's usage. (See *WhatsApp, Inc. v. Nasser Bahaj*, WIPO Case No. D2016- 0581).

The fact that the DDN resolves to an inactive website, does not prevent a finding of bad faith either (See *WhatsApp LLC v. Vincent Lai, YH Tec, WIPO Case No. D2024-2974*).

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

7. Decision

Upon reviewing the contentions and information provided by the Complainant above, the Panel acknowledges that the “WhatsApp” mark is registered and owned by the Complainant and the Respondent has no trademark rights over it.

The continuous use of the DDN may adversely affect the business and could jeopardize the reputation of the Complainant by amounting to confusion of ownership of the DDN even if they might be situated in different and separate jurisdictions.

The equitable and complete use of the Complainant’s rights requires them to exercise sole ownership and control of any associated domain names and/ or trademarks/ logos of WhatsApp, in order to prevent any confusion and ambiguity for users and the public, in general.

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

1. The Respondent’s registration of the DDN does not violate 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, and;
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 <whatsappgold.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: 02 January 2026