

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WhatsApp, LLC v. Fakhar Abbas, GN
Case No. D2025-1818

1. The Parties

The Complainant is WhatsApp, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Fakhar Abbas, GN, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <na7whatsapp.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2025. On May 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 8, 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 May 9, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 15, 2025.


The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 May 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Hong Yang as the sole panelist in this matter on June 20, 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 is a United States corporation providing mobile messaging applications (apps) under the mark of WHATSAPP for mobile devices, with over 2 billion users in over 180 countries. WhatsApp has consistently ranked among the top apps in the market, being the fourth most popular app globally according to “Business Of Apps” and the third most downloaded app globally according to “App Figures”.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademarks containing the term “WhatsApp” or relevant figure globally, including the following: United States Registration No. 3939463 for WHATSAPP, registered on April 5, 2011; European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 009986514 for WHATSAPP, registered on October 25, 2011; International Trademark Registration No. 1109890 for , registered on January 10, 2012.

The Complainant also owns various domain names containing the term “WhatsApp”, including the one under which it operates its official website, <whatsapp.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 21, 2024. According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, at the time of filing of this Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying prominently the Complainant’s word trademark, as well as its figurative mark using its designed logotype changing the color, with mere addition of the letters and number “na7” in both of them. The website offered for download unauthorized, modified versions of the Complainant’s app under the sign “NA7 Whatsapp”, with claimed added functions.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

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, 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 mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, “na7” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 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 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 3.0](#), 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 available record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated or otherwise authorized by the Complainant or held any registration of the WHATSAPP mark anywhere. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant’s word mark and figurative mark with addition of two letters and one number without any specific meaning, using substantially the original design of the logo in a different color. It is apparent that the Respondent has attempted to take an unfair advantage from the Complainant’s mark as well as its copyrighted software. The Panel considers more likely than not that the purportedly modified version of WhatsApp offered on the website at the disputed domain name, without any consent or authorization from the Complainant, may contain malware with illegitimate purposes of hacking or phishing for personal data of the Complainant’s customers. Those cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent incorporated, without any license or authorization the Complainant’s trademarks in full in the disputed domain name, plus the two letters and one number having no apparent meaning. The Complainant’s trademark WHATSAPP is highly well known globally, and the Complainant’s registration and use of its mark much predates the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name is also confusingly similar to the Complainant’s official domain name <whatsapp.com>, indicating the Respondent’s ultimate intent to confuse

unsuspecting Internet users seeking or expecting the Complainant. Thus, the Respondent must have known of the Complainant's mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, considering the use of the disputed domain name as analyzed in Section 6.B above, the Panel finds that the Respondent 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 the Respondent's website. The disputed domain name was thus registered and is being used in bad faith, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <na7whatsapp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Hong Yang/

Hong Yang

Sole Panelist

Date: July 4, 2025