

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

WhatsApp LLC v. pinoy tvshows  
Case No. D2025-3093

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is pinoy tvshows, Pakistan.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <gbwhatsappspro.net> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 4, 2025. On August 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 7, 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 amended Complaint on August 12, 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 August 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Qiang Ma as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 was established in 2009 and operates the WhatsApp messaging and voice-over-IP service and mobile application. WhatsApp offers a range of features, including sending and receiving messages, multimedia messaging, group chats, status display and time-limited messages. To date, WhatsApp is a world leader in messaging services for mobile devices with over two billion users across over 180 countries and regions. Available in 60 different languages, WhatsApp is ranked as one of the most popular mobile applications.

The Complainant is the owner of a portfolio of WHATSAPP trademark registrations, including but not limited to the United States Trademark WHATSAPP, registered on April 5, 2011 and designated for International Class 42 (US Trademark Registration Number 3939463), the European Union ("EU") Trademark WHATSAPP, registered on October 25, 2011 and designated for International Classes 9, 38 and 42 (EU Trademark Registration Number 009986514), and International Trademark WHATSAPP, registered on May 24, 2011 and designated for International Classes 9 and 38 (International Trademark Registration Number 1085539, designated countries include Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Botswana, Belarus, Switzerland, China, Egypt, Ghana, Croatia, Israel, Iceland, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kazakhstan, Republic of Moldova, Madagascar, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Singapore, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam).

Besides, the Complainant holds the domain names <whatsapp.com>, <whatsapp.net>, <whatsapp.org>, <whatsapp.info>, and <whatsapp.biz>.

The Respondent is pinoy tvshows, based in Pakistan.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 16, 2024. The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage titled "GBWhatsApp Pro APK Download (Updated) 2025 Anti-Ban | OFFICIAL," which claims to offer an modified APK version of the WhatsApp mobile application for download. Furthermore, the webpage predominantly displays the Complainant's word and device marks, along with a detailed download guide. Additionally, the webpage includes a separate tab titled "Disclaimer," which states that GBWhatsApp is an unofficial modification of WhatsApp.

On June 9, 2025, the Complainant's lawyers sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via email. However, this letter was not successfully delivered to 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their WHATSAPP trademark. The addition of the letters "gb," "pro", and "s" does not prevent a finding of confusingly similarity, as the Complainant's trademark is incorporated in the disputed domain name. Secondly, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Thirdly, the Complainant's WAHTSAPP trademark is inherently distinctive and well known throughout the world in connection with

messaging applications. This prominence suggests that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name could not have been in good faith. Furthermore, given the similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark, and considering the content of the Respondent's website, which features prominent references to the Complainant and their trademarks, Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the Respondent is somewhat affiliated with the Complainant. This supports a finding of bad faith use.

## **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 entirety of the WHATSAPP mark is reproduced 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, "gb," "s", and "pro" 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.

Firstly, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name or a similar name. The Respondent has not acquired or applied for any trademark registrations for “GBWHATSAPSPRO” or “GB WHATSAPP PRO.” The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name offers an unauthorized modified version of the WHATSAPP mobile application. Given the above, the Respondent could not have any reasonable or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the Respondent does not appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that specifically targets the Complainant by offering an unauthorized, modified version of the Complainant’s WhatsApp mobile application and predominantly displays the Complainant’s word and device trademarks. Moreover, the website explicitly states that “GBWhatsApp” is an unofficial modification of WhatsApp. This indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant in mind when registering and using the disputed domain name and intended to exploit it for unfair profit. Accordingly, the Respondent fails to demonstrate any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the Respondent is providing unauthorized, modified versions of the Complainant’s WhatsApp mobile application, and the website prominently displays the Complainant’s marks and logo. Furthermore, the website fails to fully and accurately disclose the relationship between the parties. Although the Respondent has added a disclaimer to clarify the relationship with the Complainant, consumers are still likely to be misled by the disputed domain name and the appearance of the website into believing that there is an actual relationship between the parties. The disclaimer is displayed in another section of the Respondent’s website and is unlikely to be seen by most users of the Respondent’s website. Accordingly, the Respondent does not appear to be making any bona fide offering of goods and services.

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 intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. Specifically, the Complainant’s WHATSAPP trademarks are inherently distinctive, and the Complainant’s WhatsApp mobile application is well-known throughout the world for mobile communication services. Given this, the Respondent’s registration for the disputed domain name, which closely resembles the Complainant’s trademarks, clearly indicates bad faith in registration.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that promotes an unauthorized, derivative, and competing service to the Complainant’s well-known WhatsApp mobile application. This means that the Respondent is attempting to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s reputation, indicating bad faith in using the disputed domain name. By using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract 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 services marketed therein. This is in bad faith pursuant to 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 <gbwhatsappspro.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Qiang Ma/*

**Qiang Ma**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 29, 2025