

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0009

Also in PDF C2026-0009

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

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by APK Bundles, with the contact name being APK Bundles, with their address being Mohalla Shumali Chah Ghallu Wala Tehsil Taunsa Sharif District DG Khan and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is apkbundles@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 26 January 2026. DNDRC completed an administrative review of the Complaint and communicated the same to the Complainant on 28 January 2026.

Upon the Complainant’s fulfillment of the procedural obligations on 03 February 2026, DNDRC formally requested the Respondent’s registration details from PKNIC on 03 February 2026. PKNIC provided the requested details on 04 February 2026.

DNDRC issued a formal notification of the dispute to the Respondent on 11 February 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 14 April 2026. The arbitrator completed the review and issued a decision on 14 April 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 14 April 2026.

Applying Paragraph 4(a) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Rules), DNDRC appointed Mr. Muhammad Amaan Latif 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:

The Complainant

1. *The Complainant, **WhatsApp, LLC** ("**WhatsApp**"), is a provider of one of the world's most popular mobile messaging applications ("**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. WhatsApp's main website available at www.whatsapp.com also allows Internet users to access its messaging platform.*
2. *Since launching in 2009, WhatsApp has become one of the fastest growing and most popular mobile applications in the world, with over 3.3 billion monthly active users worldwide in November 2025². WhatsApp has acquired considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide, including in Pakistan. WhatsApp is one of the most downloaded applications in Pakistan and in the world.*

*A screen capture of the Complainant's main website and copies of information about the Complainant, including its Wikipedia entry, press articles on Meta's acquisition of WhatsApp in 2014, 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). For instance, <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 Complainant's trade marks

4. *In addition to its strong online presence, the Complainant has secured ownership of numerous trade mark registrations for WHATSAPP in many jurisdictions throughout the world, including in Pakistan, as detailed above.*

The Respondent, the Domain Name and the Respondent's website

5. *The Domain Name consists of an obvious and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trade mark (i.e., an additional letter "t" is inserted after the component "what"), preceded by the prefix "gb", under the ccTLD ".pk" for Pakistan.*
6. *The Domain Name points to a website at <https://gbwhatsapp.pk/> (the Respondent's website), which promotes and offers for download a modified APK version of WhatsApp known as "GB WhatsApp". This unauthorized WhatsApp APK purportedly provides functionalities that go beyond those offered in the official WhatsApp app. For instance, the website states:*

"GB WhatsApp is one of the modified versions of the official WhatsApp app. It is a flexible and advanced version of the one provided. In this app, you can hide your online status, share larger files, and have personalized themes. Also, you can run two accounts on the same phone without troubles."

7. *In addition to GB WhatsApp, the website also refers to other modified WhatsApp applications, including "FM WhatsApp", "Yo WhatsApp", "OG WhatsApp" and "WhatsApp Plus".*
8. *The Respondent's website also prominently references the Complainant's WHATSAPP trade mark, makes use of the green-and-white colour scheme used by the Complainant and*

displays logos that are similar to the Complainant's figurative trade mark, including as a favicon, as follows:

The logos, including the favicon, featured on the Website



The Complainant's WhatsApp logo



9. *The Respondent's website contains the following disclaimer, which is not prominently displayed on the homepage but is only accessible by clicking on the "Disclaimer" tab:*

"The information provided by GBWhatsApp on this website and app is for general informational purposes only. [...] Please note, it is a modified version of WhatsApp and is not endorsed or affiliated with WhatsApp Inc. It is important to understand the legal and ethical implications of using modified apps."

*Screen captures of the Respondent's website are provided as **Annex 6**.*

10. *On 18 December 2025, the Complainant's lawyers attempted to send a cease and desist letter to the Respondent using the two email addresses (support@gbwhatsapp.pk and gbwhatsapp.pk@gmail.com) listed on the Respondent's website. However, these attempts resulted in immediate delivery failure notifications.*

*Copies of the Complainant's cease and desist letter and the delivery failure notifications are provided as **Annex 7**.*

*Screen captures of the website to which the Domain Name redirected as at 17 December 2025, together with evidence of redirection are provided as **Annex 6**.*

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

Therefore, the Complainant seeks the following remedy:

In accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy, the Complainant requests that the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding transfer the Domain Name to the Complainant.

(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:

1. **The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark**
(Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i); Rules, paragraphs 3(b)(viii), (b)(ix)(1)).
12. *The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to establish first, that it has rights in a trade mark or service mark, and secondly, that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trade mark or service mark.*
13. *The Complainant owns numerous trade mark registrations for WHATSAPP in jurisdictions throughout the world, including in Pakistan (Annex 3). The Complainant has therefore*

established trade mark rights in WHATSAPP for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

- 14. The Domain Name comprises a misspelling of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trade mark (i.e., "whattsapp" where an additional letter "t" is inserted after the component "what"), which is visually highly similar and phonetically identical to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trade mark. The Complainant therefore submits that the presence of such obvious and intentional misspelling is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's trade mark; see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.9 and WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Mohsin, DNDRC Case No. 2025-0022 (<gbwhatsapp.pk>).*
- 15. Further, the Complainant submits that the mere addition of the prefix "gb" in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's WHATSAPP trade mark, which remains recognizable in the Domain Name; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8 and WhatsApp LLC v. Younus Waqar, DNDRC Case No. 2024-0009 (<gbwhatsapps.pk>).*
- 16. Finally, the addition of ".pk" ccTLD 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 trade mark, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has not submitted any response.

The Complainant contends that the DDN is confusingly similar to its WHATSAPP trademark. For the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel undertakes a comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the DDN to determine whether the mark is recognizable within the domain name.

The Panel notes that the Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks for WHATSAPP in jurisdictions worldwide, including in Pakistan, thereby establishing trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy.

The DDN comprises a misspelling of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, namely "whatsapp", where an additional letter "t" is inserted. The Panel finds that this constitutes a clear case of typo squatting, as the DDN is visually highly similar to the Complainant's mark. As noted in section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, a domain name consisting of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered confusingly similar to that trademark. This approach has also been followed in prior DNDRC decisions involving the Complainant.

The Panel further finds that the addition of the prefix "gb" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Pursuant to section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the addition of descriptive, meaningless, or non-distinctive elements does not avoid confusing similarity where the trademark remains recognizable within the domain name.

The Panel also notes that the ccTLD ".pk" is a technical requirement of domain name registration and may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity, in line with section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the DDN is confusingly similar to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark and that the Complainant has satisfied 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:

2. **The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name**
(Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii); Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(2))

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 has made unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademarks to promote third-party modified versions of WhatsApp. Nevertheless, even if one is to apply the Oki Data criteria, the Respondent at least failed to fulfil the first and third Oki Data criteria (see WIPO Overview 3.0, [section 2.8](#)) :
- i.) The Respondent's website purports to offer for download or promote unauthorized modified versions of the Complainant's WhatsApp application. As such, the Respondent cannot be said to be using the Domain Name to offer the goods or services at issue, namely the WhatsApp application.
 - ii.) While the Respondent's website contains a disclaimer, the Respondent does not accurately or prominently disclose its lack of relationship with the Complainant. In fact, the disclaimer is not prominently displayed on the website but is only accessible by clicking on the "Disclaimer" tab. In addition, this website displays variations of the Complainant's figurative trade mark and logo, including as a favicon, as well as a

*similar green and white colour scheme to that of the Complainant's WhatsApp app, which suggests endorsement by/affiliation with the Complainant (see **Annex 6**).*

21. *As mentioned above, the APK versions are modified versions of WhatsApp, developed by a third party. The Complainant is committed to maintaining the integrity of its WhatsApp service and does not support such third-party applications. As such, the Respondent is making unauthorized use of the Complainant's trade marks in the Domain Name and on its website, to offer services that violate the Complainant's Terms of Service⁷. 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.).*
22. *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 Name

23. *The registrant information for the Domain Name is redacted in the publicly-available WhoIs database (see **Annex 2**).*
24. *There being no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, the Complainant submits that the mere reference to "GB WhatsApp" on the "Contact Us" page of the Respondent's website is not sufficient to demonstrate that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.3.*
25. *To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, there is no evidence of the Respondent having obtained or applied for any trade mark registration or similar right for "WhatsApp", "GB WhatsApp" or any variation as reflected in the Domain Name.*
26. *Furthermore, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name to promote unauthorised WhatsApp APKs 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 trade mark 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 any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names

28. *Neither can the Respondent assert that it has made or is currently making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Domain Name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.*
29. *Prior UDRP panels have consistently held that such use of the Domain Name to offer for download an unauthorized modified version of WhatsApp does not amount to legitimate noncommercial or fair use. See WhatsApp LLC v. Furqan Taunsvi, Buch Executive Villas, WIPO Case No. DCC2024-0012 (<gbwhatsapp.cc> et al.).*
30. *Therefore, the Complainant 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 any response.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN, noting that the Respondent neither uses the DDN for any bona fide or legitimate purpose nor holds any authorization, whether express or implied, to incorporate or otherwise use the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has never been permitted to make any use of its trademarks.

Under established UDRP practice, it is generally recognized that requiring a complainant to prove the absence of a respondent's rights or legitimate interests would amount to proving a negative. Panels therefore assess whether a complainant has established a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, upon which the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate otherwise. In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established such a prima facie case under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1 and *WIPO Case No. D2015-1149*.

Firstly, the Complainant has neither licensed nor otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its WHATSAPP trademark, rendering any claim to a bona fide offering of goods or services through the DDN untenable. The Respondent's website promotes and offers for download unauthorized modified versions of the Complainant's WhatsApp application. Prior panels have held that offering such unauthorized modified versions does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services

under the Policy; see *WIPO Case No. D2016-0581*, *WIPO Case No. D2025-0340*. Even if the Oki Data criteria were to be considered, the Respondent fails to satisfy them, as it is not offering the Complainant's genuine services and does not accurately or prominently disclose the lack of any relationship with the Complainant; see *WIPO Case No. D2025-1157*. The presence of a disclaimer accessible only through a separate tab, combined with the use of the Complainant's trademarks, logos, and a similar colour scheme, reinforces the likelihood of user confusion and implied affiliation.

Secondly, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the DDN or by the Complainant's mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The publicly available WHOIS information for the DDN is redacted, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in "WhatsApp", "GB WhatsApp", or any variation thereof. The mere reference to "GB WhatsApp" on the Respondent's website does not establish that the Respondent is commonly known by the DDN.

Thirdly, the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the DDN without intent for commercial gain or to misleadingly divert consumers, within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The Respondent's use of the DDN to promote unauthorized third-party applications clearly fails this criterion.

In view of the foregoing, the burden of production has shifted to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. The Respondent has failed to submit any response or evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the DDN, and the Complainant has therefore satisfied the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

III. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

3. **The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith**

(Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii), 4(b); Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3))

31. *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.*

32. *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

33. *The Complainant's WHATSAPP trade mark 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**).*
34. *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 8**.*

35. *Given the Complainant's renown and goodwill worldwide and particularly its popularity and trade mark rights well established prior to the registration of the Domain Name, the Complainant submits that the Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant or its WHATSAPP trade mark when registering the Domain Name in 2024. See, for example, WhatsApp Inc. v. Francisco Costa, WIPO Case No. D2015-0909 (, registered in 2012)¹⁰ and WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Mohsin, *supra*.*
36. *The content of the Respondent's website clearly demonstrates the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its trade marks, as it makes multiple references to the Complainant and offers for download an unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's application. The Complainant's WHATSAPP trade mark is a coined term, exclusively associated with the Complainant and its messaging services. All these factors clearly indicates the Respondent's intent to target the Complainant's trade marks at the time of registration of the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.2.1 as well as WhatsApp LLC v. Younus Waqar, *supra**
37. *The Complainant submits that the Respondent, having no relationship with the Complainant or authorization to make use of its trade mark in a domain name or otherwise, registered the Domain Name with a view to promoting unauthorized APK versions of the Complainant's messaging application, in bad faith.*

38. Finally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent's inclusion of non-functioning email addresses on its website, as evidenced by the delivery failure notifications generated in response to the Complainant's cease and desist letter (see Annex 7), constitutes further evidence of bad faith; see *Rack Room Shoes of Virginia, LLC v. lin hai*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3214.

Use in bad faith

39. Given the confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's trade mark, as well as the content and layout of the Respondent's website as described above (see **Annex 6**), Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the Respondent's website is somehow affiliated with or otherwise endorsed by the Complainant, which is not the case.
40. The Respondent's website offers for download or promotes unauthorized modified versions of the WhatsApp application, developed by third parties. It is more likely than not that the owner(s) of such third-party applications ultimately derive(s) commercial advantage from the Respondent's unauthorized use of the Complainant's trade mark 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 and *WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Mohsin*, *supra*.
41. The Complainant therefore submits that by using the Domain Name in this fashion, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the goods and services marketed therein, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See *WhatsApp LLC v. Gulsher Khan*, WIPO Case No. D2024-0910 (<gbwhatsappdownloadapk.net> et al.) and *WhatsApp LLC v. Nayan Borse and Mohd Syazuan Saad, Bix Charity Kb*, WIPO Case No. D2023 3186 (<easywasap.com> et al).
42. Furthermore, the promotion of unauthorized modified WhatsApp APKs not only violates the Complainant's Terms of Service but also places the security of WhatsApp users at risk. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name to offer such modified APKs under the Complainant's trade mark disrupts the Complainant's business by driving WhatsApp users to third-party applications. Prior UDRP panels have held that such activities amount to use of a domain name in bad faith, given their potential to enable phishing schemes or malware distribution.

See, for instance, WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Sibtain Riaz, DNDRC Case No. 2025-0021 (<gbwhatsapp.pk>).

43. *Finally, although the Respondent's website contains a disclaimer regarding the lack of relationship with the Complainant, it is not displayed prominently and is only accessible by clicking on the "Disclaimer" tab. The Complainant submits that even if a prominent disclaimer had been featured on the 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 and Instagram, LLC v. Protection of Private Person / Yurii Shemetilo / Olha, WIPO Case No. D2022-2832 (<insta-stories.online> et al.).*
44. *In view of the above, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has not submitted any response.

The Complainant contends that the DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant submits that the Respondent intentionally seeks to attract internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, misleading users as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services offered thereon. The Panel acknowledges these contentions and considers paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP Policy to be directly applicable, while also taking into account other indicia of bad faith evident from the record.

The Panel finds that the DDN was registered in bad faith. The Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark is inherently distinctive and enjoys worldwide recognition, including in Pakistan, through extensive and continuous use. The evidence on record, including search engine results, demonstrates that the term "WhatsApp" is exclusively associated with the Complainant. In these circumstances, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. Prior panels have recognized the mark's prominence and ordered the transfer of DDNs in similar cases; see *WIPO Case No. D2018-1581*

The Respondent's bad faith intent is further evidenced by the content of the website associated with the DDN, which makes repeated reference to the Complainant and promotes unauthorized modified versions of the Complainant's application. The use of a misspelled version of the WHATSAPP trademark in the DDN, coupled with the website's content, demonstrates a deliberate attempt to exploit the Complainant's goodwill; see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.1, and *WIPO Case No. D2025-0321*.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the DDN resolves to a website offering or promoting unauthorized modified APK versions of the WhatsApp application developed by third parties. Such use is likely to confer commercial or reputational benefit on the Respondent or associated third parties. By using the DDN in this manner, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users by creating confusion as to affiliation or endorsement, which constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also considers the Respondent's conduct in providing non-functioning contact details, as evidenced by failed delivery of communications, to be an additional indicator of bad faith. Such behavior is inconsistent with good faith registration and use of a domain name.

Further, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the DDN to promote unauthorized modified applications not only violates the Complainant's Terms of Service but also poses potential security risks to users and disrupts the Complainant's business. Prior panels have held that such conduct may support a finding of bad faith use.

Finally, while the Respondent's website appears to contain a disclaimer, it is not prominently displayed and is insufficient to dispel confusion. In any event, the presence of a disclaimer does not cure an otherwise abusive registration, particularly where the overall presentation of the website suggests affiliation with the Complainant.

Considering all of the above, and in the absence of any response from the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith. Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 "WHATSAPP", and "gbwhatsapp.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 registered trademark could result in hinderance in exercise of the rights of the Complainant in the trademark and could also jeopardize the reputation of the Complainant by amounting to confusion regarding the ownership of the DDN.

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

1. The 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 <gbwhatsapp.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.

Arbitrator: Muhammad Amaan Latif

Sole Panelist

Date: 14 April 2026