

ARBITRATION AND MEDIATION CENTER

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WhatsApp LLC v. mazhar hussain Case No. D2025-0452

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is mazhar hussain, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jtwhatsapp.biz> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 5, 2025, concerning <jtwhatsapp.biz> and <jtwhatsapp.com>. On February 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 6, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent ("REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 7, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On February 13, 2025, the Respondent sent an email to the Center. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 19, 2025, which only concerned <jtwhatsapp.biz>. On the same day, the Complainant requested the withdrawal of the domain name <jtwhatsapp.com> from the present proceeding. On February 20, 2025, the Center acknowledged receipt of the withdrawal regarding the domain name <jtwhatsapp.com>.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 proceeding commenced on February 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on March 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 2025. 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, WhatsApp LLC, is a world-wide mobile messaging application. The Complainant was founded in 2009 and was acquired by Facebook, Inc (now Meta) in 2014. Today WhatsApp is one of the leading mobile messaging applications, with more than 2.6 billion monthly active users worldwide (as of January 2023).

The Complainant holds several domain names containing the WHATSAPP trademark, among them which hosts its main website.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK				INTERNATIONAL CLASS
WHATSAPP	European Union	009986514	October 25, 2011	9, 38, and 42
MHATSAPP	International Registration	1085539	May 24, 2011	09, and 38
WHATSAPP	Pakistan	302143	February 26, 2015	38

Because the Respondent did not file a Response, not much is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 1, 2024.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name directs to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark and purporting to offer a modified APK version of the WhatsApp application known as "JTWhatsApp", with the following wording: "In Official Whatsapp limited features Are given calling, massaging [sic]. That why JIM Tech Developer introduced the a Best feature orientated JTWhatsApp 9.95 to fulfil all the needs of users. To Download JTWhatsApp latest version 9.95 offers greater functionality than the official version of WhatsApp. (...) JTWhatsApp is created by Jim Tech developer, not by an official WhatsApp company." The acronym "APK" stands for "Android Application Package Kit".

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 as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the WHATSAPP trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the prefix "JT" is not sufficient to avoid confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The trademark WHATSAPP has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its services. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. On the contrary, the Respondent's website purports to offer an unauthorized modified APK version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application, with additional features that are not offered on the Complainant's application. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not comply with the WhatsApp brand assets and guidelines that prohibit to "use other trademarks, names, domain names, logos, or other content that could be confused with WhatsApp", "use any WhatsApp trademarks, or anything similar, in your trademark, domain name, username, or other account name" and "use the WhatsApp trademark, or anything similar, as, or as part of, a second level domain name or platform username".

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark WHATSAPP at the time it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent's intent to target the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name may be inferred from the contents of the Respondent's website, which makes explicit reference to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, by intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to its website for financial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

B. Respondent

On February 13, 2025, the Respondent sent the following communication to the Center:

"Hi dear. This domain is not in my possession now and in the future. It is not belongs [sic] to me anymore. Take it. Have a good day."

Other than that, the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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, Third Edition, ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the WHATSAPP mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name <itwhatsapp.biz>.

Although the addition of other elements, such as here "JT", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that in the present case the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".biz" in the disputed domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds 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 for a complainant to prove that 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 3.0, section 2.1.

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.

Prior UDRP panels have recognized that service providers using a domain name that contains a third-party trademark may be making a bona fide offering of goods or services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Whether or not this is the case is typically assessed based on the factors listed in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. <u>D2001-0903</u>, and <u>WIPO Overview 3.0</u>, section 2.8:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's website purports to offer for download an unauthorized modified APK version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application. As such, the Respondent cannot be said to be using the Respondent's website to actually offer the goods or services at issue, namely the original WhatsApp application.

The Respondent's website features a disclaimer containing the following sentence: "JTWhatsApp is created by Jim Tech developer, not by an official WhatsApp company." In the Panel's view, this disclaimer appears to be insufficiently prominent. Considering the prominent use of the Complainant's trademark on the

Respondent's site and the fact that the Respondent does not actually offer the Complainant's services (but an unauthorized modified APK version thereof), the Panel finds the Respondent has not met the requirements set out in the above-mentioned Oki Data decision.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name in itself suggests a connection or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent which in fact does not exist.

Based on the available record, 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that that the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the Complainant's trademark is well-known and that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark and references to its services, it is clear that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its websites in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <jtwhatsapp.biz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/ Andrea Mondini Sole Panelist

Date: April 11, 2025