

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WhatsApp LLC v. Badr EL IDRISSE, BADR IDRISSE
Case No. D2025-5309

1. The Parties

The Complainant is WhatsApp LLC, United States of America, represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondent is Badr EL IDRISSE, BADR IDRISSE, Morocco.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <web-whatsapp-cloud.com> is registered with Genius Communications SARL/AU (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 18, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on January 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Gonalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on January 28, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

On January 4, 2026, the Respondent requested suspension of the proceeding pursuant to paragraph 17(a) of the Rules. The Panel notes that suspension under paragraph 17(a) requires the agreement of the Parties. As no joint request for suspension was submitted, the Panel considers it appropriate to proceed to a decision.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is WhatsApp LLC, a company established in the United States of America, provider of one of the world's most widely used mobile messaging applications, launched in 2009 and acquired by Meta Platforms, Inc. in 2014. The Complainant operates globally and offers messaging services via mobile applications and through its official website at "www.whatsapp.com".

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark WHATSAPP in multiple jurisdictions. For the purposes of the present proceeding, the following trademark registrations are noted:

United States of America Trademark Registration No. 3,939,463, WHATSAPP, registered on April 5, 2011; European Union Trade Mark No. 009986514, WHATSAPP, registered on October 25, 2011; Moroccan Trade Mark No. 181057, WHATSAPP, registered on April 14, 2017.

These registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name <web-whatsapp-cloud.com> was registered on August 26, 2024.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website promoting a business marketing and messaging platform branded as "WhatsCRM Cloud", inviting Internet users to register or log in for services presented as related to WhatsApp business messaging. The website made repeated references to the Complainant's trademark, adopted a green-and-white color scheme similar to that associated with the Complainant, and displayed a logo visually reminiscent of the Complainant's figurative mark. The website did not contain any disclaimer indicating the absence of a relationship with the Complainant.

On November 21, 2025, the Complainant, through its representatives, sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. No reply was received.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

1. it owns prior rights in the WHATSAPP trademark, protected by multiple registrations in various jurisdictions, including the United States of America, the European Union, and Morocco, all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name.
2. the WHATSAPP trademark is highly distinctive and widely known worldwide, due to its continuous use since 2009, its very large global user base, and its extensive online and media presence.
3. the disputed domain name incorporates the WHATSAPP trademark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the descriptive terms "web" and "cloud", which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the trademark remains clearly recognizable.
4. it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the WHATSAPP trademark, whether in a domain name or otherwise.

5. the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, holds no corresponding trademark rights, and is not making any legitimate, noncommercial, or bona fide use of the disputed domain name.
6. the disputed domain name resolves to a website promoting a business messaging and marketing platform branded as “WhatsCRM Cloud”, inviting Internet users to create accounts or log in, and referring to services associated with the WhatsApp ecosystem.
7. the website associated with the disputed domain name uses a green-and-white colour scheme and graphic elements similar to those of the Complainant, including a logo visually reminiscent of the Complainant’s figurative mark.
8. the presentation of the website and the services offered are likely to lead Internet users to believe, incorrectly, that there is a commercial relationship, affiliation, or authorization by the Complainant.
9. the website does not contain any clear disclaimer denying an association between the Respondent and the Complainant.
10. in light of the notoriety of the WHATSAPP trademark and the content of the website, the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant’s mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.
11. the disputed domain name was registered and is being used with the intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the services offered.
12. it sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on November 21, 2025, to which no response was received.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response under the Rules. On January 4, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center acknowledging receipt of the Complaint, recognizing the Complainant’s rights in the WHATSAPP trademark, and stating that he voluntarily consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The Respondent further requested that the proceeding be suspended pursuant to paragraph 17(a) of the Rules to allow an amicable settlement.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name reproduces the WHATSAPP trademark in its entirety, together with the additional terms “web” and “cloud”, separated by hyphens. The trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of such descriptive terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level-Domain “.com” is disregarded for the purposes of this assessment.

The Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The record supports that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, which occurred after the Complainant had secured trademark protection.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to operate a website offering services closely related to those of the Complainant, while reproducing the Complainant’s trademark and visual elements and without any disclaimer. This constitutes an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <web-whatsapp-cloud.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira/

Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira

Sole Panelist

Date: February 19, 2026