ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Ramzan
Case No. D2025-2718

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Muhammad Ramzan, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 9, 2025. On July 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 11, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 11, 2025, *n*, 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 amended Complaint on July 16, 2025.

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 proceedings commenced on July 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Petter Rindforth as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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, founded in 2009, is a provider of a mobile messaging application ("app"), with over 2.8 billion monthly active users worldwide in January 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names comprising its WHATSAPP trademark, under various generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") as well as under many country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs").

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for WHATSAPP, including but not limited to:

United States Registration No. 3,939,463 WHATSAPP (word), registered on April 5, 2011, for services in International Class 42;

International Registration No. 1085539, WHATSAPP (word), registered on May 24, 2011, for goods and services in International Classes 9 and 38, and designating 26 jurisdictions; and

European Union Trade Mark No. 009986514, WHATSAPP (word), registered on October 25, 2011, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 38, and 42.

The disputed domain name is <bluewhatsapp.info>.

The disputed domain name was created on November 25, 2023, and resolves to an active website offering for download an unauthorized modified APK2 version of the WhatsApp application, and using a modified version of the Complainant's WhatsApp logo and trademark.

No further information is available on the Respondent.

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 the web site connected to the disputed domain name features a step-by-step guide to how to download the modified APK version of the WhatsApp application, but with no disclaimer as to its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

On May 27, 2025, the Complainant's lawyers sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via email and submitted a Registrar registrant contact form notice. No response was received.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, preceded by the term "blue", under the gTLD ".info".

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or

services, as is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor has the Complainant authorized the Respondent to make any use of its WHATSAPP trademark, in a domain name or otherwise.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark is well known and famous worldwide, and the nature of the Respondent's website clearly demonstrates actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks as it makes prominent reference to the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark and official application, and features a modified version of the Complainant's WhatsApp logo and figurative trade mark, including as a favicon. Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the Respondent's website is somehow affiliated with or otherwise endorsed by the Complainant.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and the services offered therein, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 "blue", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds 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. See *WhatsApp LLC v. Faheem Lashari*, WIPO Case No. D2024-4186: "Although the addition of other terms (here, "blue" and "plus" in the disputed domain names) 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 names and the respective marks for the purposes of the Policy".

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 disputed domain name is linked to a web site offering services related to the Complainant, with no authorization by the Complainant. Previous panels have held that the use of the disputed domain name for a website using the Complainant's trademarks and purportedly offering a non-original version of an application not being from the Complainant cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy. See *WhatsApp LLC v. Aamir Altaf, G11*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2579; *WhatsApp, Inc. v. Nasser Bahaj*, WIPO Case No. D2016-0581; and *WhatsApp LLC v. GB Apps, Apps.Pk*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2770.

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 is using the disputed domain name for a web site featuring a step-by-step guide to how to download the modified APK version of the Complainant's Whatsapp application, but with no disclaimer as to its lack of relationship with the Complainant. Further, the said web site is using figurative versions of the Complainant's trademark and an "informative" text that adds to the impression that the services are related to, offered via, or accepted by, the Complainant.

The said use clearly indicates that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's prior rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and that it has since then been used in bad faith by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark for the Respondent's benefit.

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 <bluewhatsapp.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Petter Rindforth/
Petter Rindforth
Sole Panelist
Date: September 3, 2025