



Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0018

Also in PDF C2026-0018

1. The Complainant

The Complainant is ZARA SHAHJAHAN, having its office at Plot No. 7, Shareefabad Industrial Estate, Nadir Chowk, Roohi Ferozpur Road, Lahore, Pakistan. The Complainant has initiated the complaint via their authorized representative, Ali & Associates, Attorney at Law, having their office at First Floor, Shaheen Tower, 23-A, Block 6, PECHS, Karachi.

2. The Domain Name and Respondent

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

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by pk50765 with the contact name Umair Sabir, with their address at P-658 Usama Height Hussain Chowk Shadman Road near Railway Crossing Tariqabad and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is ismian.umairss88@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 28 April 2026. An administrative review of the Complaint was conducted and completed on 30 April 2026, following which the Complainant was notified of the compliance review's completion and the subsequent procedural requirements on 30 April 2026.

Upon the Complainant's fulfillment of the procedural requirements on 6 May 2026, DNDRC formally requested the Respondent's registration details from PKNIC on 12 May 2026. PKNIC provided the requested details on 15 May 2026.

DNDRC issued a formal notification of the dispute to the Respondent on 15 May 2026, enclosing a copy of the Complaint and a Response Form, informing the Respondent that failure to submit a Response within 10 days would result in the dispute proceeding ex parte.

The Complaint along with all relevant material was referred to the appointed panelist for review and decision on 10 June 2026. The panelist completed the review and issued a decision on 08 July 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 09 July 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 panelist who has verified that the Complaint satisfies the formal requirements of the Policy and the Rules.

Factual Background

4. Parties Contentions

(a) Complainant

The Complainant's brief contentions are reproduced below:

The Complainant

- 1. That the Complainant (where the context so requires includes its predecessors in business, legacy companies/ businesses, subsidiaries and affiliated concerns) is a well-established fashion brand in Pakistan, founded by Zara Shahjahan in Lahore in 2002, renowned for its timeless prêt and luxury collections inspired by vintage Pakistani fashion, nature, and meticulous craftsmanship using premium fabrics through online website and their flagship stores.*
- 2. That the subject matter of this complaint is the domain name "www.zarashahjahan.pk" (hereinafter referred to as the "**impugned domain name**"), which has been registered by the Respondent, and infringes upon the Complainant's known trademarks "**ZARA SHAHJAHAN**".*

3. *That before adverting to the legal grounds of the instant complaint, it is imperative to briefly outline the factual history of the Complainant and their extensive and continuous use of the well-known trademark “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” either alone or in conjunction with other marks.*
4. *That Complainant is a well-established fashion brand that has been successfully operating for over two decades and is one of the leading company in fashion industry, invested heavily in developing an extensive retail and online presence, including flagship outlets in major cities such as Lahore and Karachi, shop-in-shops with leading multi-brand retailers, seasonal lawn and festive collections, and a strong e-commerce platform and social-media footprint which collectively promote and sell products under the “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” mark. The affiliates can be accessed at the Complainant’s website <https://www.zarashahjahan.com.pk/>.*

*(Screenshot of the Complainant’s website is attached herewith as
Annexure- “A”)*

5. *As evident from the above, the Complainant is driven by growth and actively pursues business expansion through strategic investments in order to expand its footprint in fashion industry. It is worthy to note that majority of the Complainant business names, collections, subsidiaries, flagship stores extensively utilize the trade name/trademark “ZARA SHAHJAHAN”, as an essential component of their brand identity.*
6. *That in light of the aforementioned the Complainant’s trademark/trade name/house mark “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” is distinctive of the Complainant as it originates from the Complainant’s own name that has acquired long standing reputation that is spread across Pakistan resulting in the Complainant’s goods enjoying significant commercial success as a result of which Complainant’s mark is now considered well-known mark.*
7. *That in respect of Complainant’s services and goods in fashion industry the trademark “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” has resulted in becoming an integral identifier of the Complainant’s group whereby any person or entity would associate the trademark used alone or in conjunction with other marks, with the Complainant and none else. Therefore, any trade name/ trademark and/or domain name incorporating and originating from the Complainant only.*

8. *The Complainant in order to protect its trademark/ tradename “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” has applied for registration of its trademark/ trade name “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” in Pakistan, and also operates a website under the domain name www.zarashahjahan.com.*
9. *That in addition to the above it is imperative to note that www.zarashahjahan.com is a registered domain name of the Complainant across multiple domain hosts. The Complainant holds legitimate interests and rights in the said domain name, which have been established through registration and continuous use. As such, any unauthorized or infringing use of the aforementioned domain names constitute a gross violation of the Complainant’s rights and is strictly actionable per say.*

*(Screenshot of domain name registrations of the complainant is attached herewith as
Annexure- “B”)*

10. *That in addition to above the Complainant being the creator, first adopter, bona-fide user and prior registrant not only has extensive and continuous use of trademark “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” but has also protected its proprietary interest in the same by virtue of its trademark registrations. Therefore, the Complainant <https://zarashahjahan.com/> enjoy extensive popularity and are well known across Pakistan where the Complainant has enjoyed unparalleled success and unequivocal goodwill.*
11. *That in light of the Complainant’s exclusive proprietary rights vested in the trademark “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” as well as their associated domain names which have been in continuous use by the Complainant, the same is the only bona-fide legal and equitable owner of the trade name and trademarks “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” and entitled due protection under the law. Such protection is inclusive of, but not limited to restrain all persons from selling any products which bear the complainant's marks as well as from using any mark and or domain name similar, identical with or resembling the Complainant's trademarks which is likely to deceive or cause confusion in the course of trade and/or dilute the exclusivity of the Complainant's well-known trademarks/trade names/domain names.*
12. *That the subject matter of the Complaint is the domain name www.zarashahjahan.com.pk (hereinafter referred to as the “impugned domain name”), which has been registered by the Respondent with PKNIC, and infringes not only upon the Complainant’s well-known and earlier trademark “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” but also the Complainant’s registered domain www.zarashahjahan.com.*

13. *That That the Respondent has nefariously registered the unauthorized domain name with the PKNIC, by using the well-known trademarks of the Complainant, namely, “ZARA & SHAHJAHAN”. That the Respondent has no right or legitimate motive for the blatant adoption of a domain name that comprises of the Complainant's distinguished trademark. Thus, it is clear that the Respondent has intentionally and illegally registered the domain name to capitalize upon the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant and pass off itself as the Complainant and/or attempt to show a nexus with the complainant. Moreover, it is reiterated that the impugned domain name is a blatant and illegal adoption of the Complainant's domain name www.zarashahjahan.com. The Respondent's illicit and nefarious activities can be further substantiated by the fact that the Respondent is claiming to be the ‘Official website of Zara Shahjahan’ where in reality it has no nexus with the Complainant.*
14. *That the impugned domain name have been set up and operated as scam website, which falsely purports to offer genuine “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” products but in reality, delivers goods that are materially different in quality, design and specifications from those advertised and ordered by consumers. Numerous instances have come to the Complainant’s attention where customers, believing the impugned websites to websites to be an official or authorized online stores of the Complainant, have placed orders and received substandard and/or entirely different products, or in some cases have not received any products at all, thereby suffering financial loss and distress. Such fraudulent conduct directly exploits and undermines the goodwill, reputation and trust painstakingly built by the Complainant over the years, causes significant confusion and disappointment among consumers, and tarnishes the “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” brand by associating it with inferior and deceptive trade practices.*
15. *That the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name and its associated website are being used as a vehicle for phishing and online fraud by falsely posing as the Complainant’s official e-commerce platform. Through this deception, users are induced to disclose personal and payment information and to make online purchases in the mistaken belief that they are dealing directly with Zara Shahjahan, whereas in reality their data and funds are being diverted to the operators of the impugned website.*
16. *That in addition to the above the impugned domain name is a blatant infringement of the Complainant’s registered domain name www.zarashahjahan.com. That, in the realm of the internet, a domain name is more than just a website address and therefore, merits the same level of protection as a brand. It is imperative to note that unwary customers of the Complainant, may access the Respondent’s website believing it to be the Complainant’s.*

Thus, the Complainant places reliance on the following legal grounds against the Respondent's domain name.

Therefore, the Complainant seeks the following remedy:

Handover the Impugned Registration to the Complainant and/or cancel the Impugned Domain Name.

(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:

1. *It is humbly submitted that the Respondent's domain name is at entirety same as Complainant's distinguished and well-known trademarks namely, "ZARA SHAHJAHAN". Additionally the Respondent's impugned domain name is deceptively similar to the Complainant's domain name www.zarashahjahan.com. Thus, the same is not just confusingly similar but identical and a blatant adoption of the Complainant's trademarks and as such is liable to be cancelled and/or transferred to the Complainant.*
2. *That the Complainant places reliance upon the case of Atticabank S.A. V. Net Promotion. Inc (Case No. D2006-0317), where it was held that a mark which has gained substantial popularity, and goodwill, are entitled to due protection. Thus, in the instant case where impugned domain name is a blatant adoption of the Complainant's trademarks which are well-known and have substantial goodwill therein is in violation of this provision. As such the marks of the Complainant are well-known all over Pakistan and in other countries too and deserve protection from the unauthorized adoption by the Respondent.*
3. *The Further, relying on the test of determining similarity established in the case of Asset Loan Co. Ply Ltd v Gregory Rogers (Case No. D2006-0300), any reasonable bystander would construe the wording of the domain name to be originating from the Complainant, considering the same as Complainant's trademarks with "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" being the integral identifier. Thus, any person who views/reads the domain name would naturally assume the same belongs to the Complainant and is in fact, a website that would enable the user's access to Clothing, Apparel, formals, semi formals of the Complainant.*
4. *Additionally, the overall impression or idea created by the Respondent by adopting and using the impugned domain name is that the same belongs to the Complainant since the Complainant's tradename is "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" which is her own name as well. As such, the impugned domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademarks and shall lead to inevitable confusion amongst the consumers for the impugned domain name being a website that belongs to the Complainant. The reliance is placed on the following judgment by DNDRC Bounty Co. V Irfan Shaukat (Case No. C2024 0005) where it was held that the Respondent's registration of the DDN, which incorporates the "Nature's Bounty trademark, was likely to mislead customers into believing that there is an association between the Respondent's website and the Complainant.*

The Respondent did not make a submission

The Complainant has provided information to suggest that it has applied for registration of the "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" trademark in Pakistan. The Complainant also owns and operates a domain

name in connection to its trademark, by the name of; “zarashahjahan.com”, resulting in the Complainant being commonly known by the “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” brand and already in control of an associated domain name. The Panel notes that the Complainant does not currently hold a registered trademark. However, the Panel finds that the Complainant is using the trademark “ZARA SHAHJAHAN” based on the information provided.

In determining whether the DDN is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, the Panel applies the test set out in Section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.0. This requires a side-by-side comparison of the disputed domain name and the relevant trademark to determine whether the trademark is recognizable within the domain name. Where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or at least a dominant feature of it, this will normally be sufficient to establish confusing similarity.

Applying this test, the Panel finds that the DDN incorporates the Complainant's mark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" in its entirety. The mark remains immediately recognizable within the DDN.

The Panel further notes that the additional elements ".com" and ".pk" do not distinguish the DDN from the Complainant's mark. Consistent with Section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, generic top-level domains ("gTLDs") and country-code top-level domains ("ccTLDs") are generally regarded as standard registration requirements and are disregarded when assessing confusing similarity under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's unregistered trademark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN", and the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

II. Legitimate interests in a domain name

As per paragraph 4(c), the UDRP requires the Respondent’s claim to be of legitimate interest and shall be:

“proved based on all evidence presented” that “shall demonstrate” the Respondent’s “rights or legitimate interests to the domain name for purposes of [Paragraph 4\(a\)\(ii\)](#).”

Paragraph 4(c) states that:

“(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

- 1. That it is humbly submitted that there is no legitimate reason for the Respondent to have chosen to acquire the impugned domain name other than to pass off its goods as those of the Complainant's or create a false association or nexus with the Complainant.*
- 2. That the Respondent's adoption of the impugned domain name that is basically created by the earlier, and well-known trademarks of the Complainant, specifically the integral identifier **"ZARA SHAHJAHAN"** further substantiates that the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the same and has chosen to adopt/register the same solely to create an association with the well-established goodwill of the Complainant under the trademarks **"ZARA SHAHJAHAN"**.*
- 3. That as mentioned above the Complainant has been operating for over two decades and has extensively and continuously utilized the trademark **"ZARA SHAHJAHAN"** either alone or in conjunction with other marks. Thus, when registering the impugned domain, the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant's proprietary rights in the mark **"ZARA SHAHJAHAN"** as such, the Respondent's use cannot be termed as bona fide, especially since the same is to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's goodwill. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the domain name is further substantiated by the fact that the Respondent has not put the impugned domain name to any use for any legitimate non-commercial purposes or fair use of the impugned domain name.*
- 4. That in addition to the above, the Respondent has no identity or reputation under the trademarks **"ZARA SHAHJAHAN"**, either alone or in conjunction with one another. Therefore, the Respondent's impugned domain name and/or use of the mark **"ZARA SHAHJAHAN"** is unheard of to the Complainant. As such, the Respondent has no recognition with the same and have no rights therein.*

5. *That in view of the above, it is clear that the Respondent has no legitimate interest of the impugned domain name. In fact, the Respondent by adopting the said domain name has made a sheer attempt to pass off its website as that of the Complainant either to create a false association with the Complainant or create hindrance in the Complainant's business operations. Further by accessing the Respondent's website it is evident that the same is being used for the sole purpose to reap of the profits of the Complaint as the goods are entirely same. Thus the Respondent's impugned domain name is in sheer contravention of the provisions of the policy and the rules of PKNIC as well as applicable Intellectual Property and associated law.*

The Respondent did not make a submission.

The overall burden of proof under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy rests with the Complainant. However, as recognized in Section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, requiring a complainant to prove the absence of any rights or legitimate interests would often require proof of matters that are peculiarly within the respondent's knowledge. Accordingly, where the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to produce evidence demonstrating such rights or legitimate interests. Where the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is generally regarded as having satisfied the second element of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established such a prima facie case. The evidence demonstrates that the Complainant has used the name "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" in connection with its business for over two decades and operates its business through the domain name zarashahjahan.com. The Complainant further states that it has neither authorized nor licensed the Respondent to use the name "ZARA SHAHJAHAN", and there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has been commonly known by the DDN or has acquired any independent rights in that name.

The Panel further notes that, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the website to which the DDN resolves reproduces the Complainant's branding, including a logo associated with the "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" mark, together with a similar design and color scheme, while merely adding the descriptive term "STORE". Previous UDRP panels have consistently regarded such conduct as evidence that a respondent seeks to create a false impression of affiliation with the trademark owner rather than making a bona fide offering of goods or services (see 201 Folsom Option JV, L.P. and 201 Folsom Acquisition, L.P. v. John Kirkpatrick, WIPO Case No. D2014-1359).

The Panel considers that the Respondent's use of the DDN is calculated to mislead internet users into believing that the website is operated, authorized or endorsed by the Complainant. Such conduct is inconsistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services and cannot constitute legitimate non-commercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy (see Section 2.5.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.0; Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Domains by Proxy, LLC / UFCW International Union, WIPO Case No. D2013-1304).

The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or demonstrate any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

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

III. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

- 1. That in addition to the above, it is most respectfully submitted that the Respondent has registered the domain name in sheer bad faith, which is substantiated by the Respondent's nature of business and subsequent registration of the domain, as the Complainant was already existing and a well-known brand. Moreover, it is essential to note the fact that the impugned domain names supplies' different goods than what is displayed or ordered (Refer to the Evidence annexed as Annexure: - "C").*
- 2. That in the case of Telstra Corporation Limited V. Nuclear Marshmallows (Case No. D2000-003), the two conditions/circumstances of a domain name being registered in bad faith were laid out. Firstly, the Complainants) must have strong reputation and are widely known and the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the impugned domain name. Secondly, there is no evidence whatsoever of any actual or contemplated good faith use by the Respondent.*
- 3. In the present case, it is reiterated that the Complainants being market giants have a stellar and unblemished reputation across the Pakistan under the trademark "**ZARA SHAHJAHAN**", and that the Respondent has no legitimate interest in registering the same. In addition to the lack of legitimate interest, it is important to highlight there is also no evidence that showcases any "good faith" use of the impugned domain name by the Respondent rather there is evident bad faith where the Respondent has created a scam website which can easily put the consumer at high risk of Cyber Crime.*

4. *Furthermore, in the case of Harrods Limited v. Boyd (Case No. D2000-0060) the element of bad faith in registering the domain name was highlighted through the act of selling a domain name as an attempt to capitalize on a name well known throughout the world. The same was further upheld in the case of Educational Tertiary Service v. TOEFL (WIPO Case D2000-0044), wherein it was also stated that where the Respondent has failed to establish any legitimate domain name-related use for Complainant's trademark(s) the Panel may reasonably infer that Respondent neither intended to make nor has made any legitimate use of Complainant's trademark in connection with the impugned domain name.*
5. *Therefore, even though the Respondent has not approached the Complainant for any amicable resolution or for the purposes of selling the impugned domain name and may not presently appear to have an identified track record of cyber-squatting (which remains to be ascertained), the very act of registering a domain name that is identical to the Complainant's trademark is, in itself, devoid of bona fide and constitutes bad faith. In the present digital and e-commerce landscape, such a registration and use also creates an inherent and significant risk of phishing and online fraud, whereby unsuspecting consumers can be induced to disclose personal and financial information, make online payments and transact under the mistaken belief that they are dealing with the Complainant, thereby exposing them to conduct that, in addition to bad-faith domain use, may prima facie fall foul of applicable cyber-crime and electronic fraud laws.*
6. *The registration of the domain name www.zarashahjahan.com.pk by the Respondent appears to be in direct contravention of fair business practices. It is evident that the acquisition of the impugned domain name is illegitimate and the Respondent has no bona-fide use of the same, other than the intention to disrupt the business of the Complainant. The choice of domain name deceptively similar to the well-known trademark "**ZARA SHAHJAHAN**" suggests a deliberate attempt by the Respondent to exploit the reputation, goodwill, and market presence established by the Complainant.*
7. *That the adoption of the domain name www.zarashahjahan.com.pk by the Respondent signifies a deliberate and calculated effort to lure unwary customers for commercial advantages and constitutes a fraudulent act. This action aims to create a substantial likelihood of confusion regarding the origin, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or the products/services promoted therein. By blatantly adopting the impugned domain name which contains well-established trademark "**ZARA SHAHJAHAN**".*
8. *The Respondent's adoption of an identical domain name clearly aims to exploit the reputation and online visibility of the Complainant and divert traffic from the official Zara*

Shahjahan website. This deceptive setup not only evidences bad-faith registration and use, but also creates an obvious vehicle for phishing and other cyber-crime, by inducing consumers to share personal and financial information under the false belief that they are dealing with the Complainant. In these circumstances, the impugned registration is liable to be cancelled and/or transferred to the Complainant.

The Respondent did not make a submission.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the DDN in bad faith, relying on the unauthorized use of the Complainant's trade name, branding and associated website content. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's website displays goods identical to those offered by the Complainant and, in certain instances, supplies goods different from those ordered, thereby reinforcing the deceptive nature of the Respondent's activities.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights in the name "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" at the time the DDN was registered. The DDN incorporates the Complainant's name in its entirety, while the associated website reproduces the Complainant's branding, logo, design elements and overall presentation. These circumstances make it implausible that the Respondent independently selected the DDN without knowledge of the Complainant or its business. As recognized in Section 3.2.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, where the circumstances indicate that the respondent knew or should have known of the complainant's rights, such knowledge supports a finding of bad-faith registration.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By registering a domain name that wholly incorporates the Complainant's name and using it in connection with a website that imitates the Complainant's branding and online presence, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and the goods offered through it. Such conduct has consistently been recognized by UDRP panels as evidence of bad-faith registration and use (see *Arla Foods Amba and Mejeriforeningen Danish Dairy Board v. Mohammad Alkurdi*, WIPO Case No. D2017-0391).

The evidence further indicates that the Respondent's website has been used to offer goods represented as those of the Complainant while, according to the evidence submitted, supplying goods different from those ordered. Whether viewed as an attempt to mislead consumers, exploit the Complainant's goodwill or facilitate fraudulent online transactions, such conduct reinforces the conclusion that the DDN has not been registered or used for any legitimate purpose but rather as an instrument of deception.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has therefore provided no explanation for its registration or use of the DDN, nor any evidence capable of rebutting the Complainant's allegations of bad faith.

Accordingly, having regard to the totality of the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

7. Decision

Upon reviewing the contentions and supporting evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established all elements required under the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy and the UDRP.

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

1. The DDN is confusingly similar to the 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 <zarashahjahan.com.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.

The Respondent may seek leave to appeal under Rule 17 of the [Supplemental Rules](#).

Ardavan D. Solan
Sole Panelist
Date: 09 July 2026