



Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0017

Also in PDF C2026-0017

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 is <zarashahjahan.pk>, hereinafter referred to as the Disputed Domain Name [“the DDN”].

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by pk13020a, with the contact name being Muhammad Ahmad Shabbir, with their address being Office #37; 2nd Floor; Sitara Tower; Factory Area and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is muhammad_ahmadshabbir@yahoo.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 30 April 2026. DNDRC completed an administrative review of the Complaint and communicated the same to the Complainant on 30 April 2026.

Upon the Complainant’s fulfillment of the procedural obligations 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 arbitrator for review and decision on 01 June 2026. The arbitrator completed the review and issued a decision on 07 July 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 07 July 2026.

Applying Paragraph 4(a) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Rules), DNDRC appointed Mr. Sunain Qazi as the sole Arbitrator who has verified that the Complaint satisfies the formal requirements of the Policy and the Rules.

4. Factual Background

(a) Complainant

The Complainant's brief contentions are reproduced below:

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 mark. <https://zarashahjahan.com/>.

(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 , 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 **"ZARA SHAHJAHAN"** 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*

(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.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.*

*(Screenshot of Evidence is attached herewith as **Annexure: - C**)*

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 has not submitted any response.

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

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:

DOMAIN NAME IS IDENTICAL AND CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TO THE COMPLAINANT'S TRADEMARKS:

[UDRP Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(i) and UDRP Rules 3(b)(viii) & 3(b)(ix)(1)]

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. *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 has not submitted any response.

The Complainant submits that it has applied for registration of the trademark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" before the competent trademark authority in Pakistan. The Complainant further operates its official domain name "zarashahjahan.com" in connection with its business, and is therefore commonly known by the "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" brand, which enjoys recognition and is associated with its online presence. While the Panel notes that the Complainant has not provided any indication that it currently holds a registered trademark, the information provided by the Complainant demonstrates that the Complainant is actively using the trademark ZARA SHAHJAHAN in connection with the sale of goods. The Panel therefore considers that the Complainant is using the trademark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN".



A plain comparison of the DDN and the Complainant's trademark shows that the DDN incorporates the Complainant's mark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" in its entirety. The only additional elements are the generic ".com" and the country-code top-level domain ".pk".

For the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel applies the test set out in section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, which requires a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the domain name. It is well established that where a domain name incorporates a complainant's trademark in its entirety, or where the mark remains clearly recognizable within the domain name, this is sufficient to establish confusing similarity under the Policy.

Applying this test, the Panel finds that the Complainant's mark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" is fully and immediately recognizable within the disputed domain name. The incorporation of the entirety of the mark is sufficient to establish a prima facie case of confusing similarity.

The Panel then considers whether the additional elements ".com" and ".pk" are capable of dispelling this finding. In accordance with section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the addition of generic, descriptive, or otherwise non-distinctive elements such as ".com" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the trademark remains clearly recognizable. Such additions are typically regarded as technical or functional components of domain names and do not add source-distinguishing value.

Further, consistent with section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the country-code top-level domain ".pk" is a technical requirement of registration and is disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. It has no source-identifying function and does not affect the comparison between the trademark and the DDN.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the DDN is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" and that paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

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:

RESPONDENT HAS NO LEGITIMATE INTEREST IN RESPECT OF THE DOMAIN NAME

[UNDRP Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(c) and UNDRP Rules 3(b)(ix)(2)]

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 Complainant 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 has not submitted any response.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the DDN, submitting that the Respondent has no plausible justification for the registration and use of a domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" other than to misappropriate its goodwill and create a false association.

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, it is well established that a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, after which the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate otherwise under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

In the present case, the Complainant asserts that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the trademark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" or to register any domain name incorporating the said mark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any capacity, nor is there any contractual or commercial relationship between the parties that would justify such use.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no identity, trade name, or business reputation corresponding to "ZARA SHAHJAHAN". There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the DDN within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Respondent cannot claim any independent rights deriving from its own name or brand.



The Complainant also contends that the selection of a domain name identical to its trademark, which has been used for over two decades and has acquired substantial goodwill, is not coincidental. Rather, it indicates knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration and supports an inference that the Respondent sought to exploit the Complainant's reputation. Panels have consistently held that such conduct is inconsistent with any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(i) or 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has not made any demonstrable legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the DDN. Instead, the use of a domain name identical to the Complainant's trademark is capable of creating an impression of affiliation or endorsement, thereby misleading internet users. Such conduct does not constitute legitimate use under the Policy.

In light of the above, the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. The Respondent has failed to provide any evidence to rebut this prima facie showing.

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

III. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

THE DOMAIN NAME IS REGISTERED AND BEING USED IN BAD FAITH
UDRP Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(iii); 4(b)(ii-iv) and UDRP Rules 3(b)(ix)(1)]

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.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 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.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 has submitted a response.

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the DDN has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The circumstances set out under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are illustrative, and not exhaustive, of bad faith conduct.

In the present case, the Panel considers paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy to be particularly relevant, which provides that bad faith is established where a respondent, by using the domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

As regards registration in bad faith, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark "ZARA SHAHJAHAN" is distinctive and has been used over an extended period in connection with its fashion and apparel business. The Complainant has also established an online presence through its official domain name "zarashahjahan.com". In light of the Complainant's longstanding use and market recognition, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the DDN.

The Panel further observes that the DDN incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. Such exact reproduction strongly indicates targeting, particularly where no additional distinguishing elements are present. This supports an inference that the Respondent selected the DDN with knowledge of the Complainant's rights and with the intention of capitalizing on its goodwill.

The Panel also takes into account that there is no evidence of any legitimate use of the DDN or any demonstrable good-faith intention to use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, the passive or deceptive nature of the registration further supports a finding of bad faith under the principles articulated in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, where bad faith may be found even in the absence of active use, depending on the circumstances of the case.

Turning to use in bad faith, the Panel finds that the incorporation of the Complainant's entire mark in the DDN creates a strong likelihood of confusion as to source or affiliation. Internet users encountering the domain name are likely to assume that it is connected to or endorsed by the Complainant. Any use of the DDN in such circumstances would inevitably result in misrepresentation and diversion of traffic intended for the Complainant.

The Panel further considers that the selection of a domain name identical to a well-established trademark, coupled with the absence of any rights or legitimate interests, is indicative of an intention to exploit the Complainant's reputation for commercial gain. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the structure of the DDN, incorporating the Complainant's mark in full, is inherently capable of creating a false impression of official association. In the context of online commerce, such impersonation carries an inherent risk of misleading consumers regarding authenticity, origin, or endorsement.

In light of the totality of the circumstances, including the Complainant's established rights, the exact reproduction of the mark in the DDN, the absence of any plausible legitimate explanation, and the likelihood of confusion created by the registration and use of the domain name, the Panel concludes that the DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

7. Decision

Upon reviewing the contentions and supporting evidence submitted by both Parties, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established all elements required under the PKNIC – Internet Domain Registration Policy and the UDRP. The Panel recognizes that the “zarashahjahan.pk” mark is registered to the Complainant, and the Respondent has no legitimate rights over it. Therefore, the continuous use of the DDN pertaining to the Complainant’s applied for 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 DDN is confusingly similar to the registered trademark of the Complainant;
2. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the DDN;
3. The DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Policy, the Panel therefore directs that the registration of the DDN <zarashahjahan.pk> be transferred to the Complainant, as requested, within forty-eight (48) hours of receipt of this decision, either by email or through its publication on the official website www.dndrc.com/cases_resolved/, whichever is earlier. The Complainant shall also remain entitled to approach PKNIC directly for enforcement of this decision.

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

Arbitrator: Sunain Qazi

Sole Panelist

Date: 07 July 2026