

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WhatsApp, LLC v. Mohamed Fasal, Mohamed Fasal

Case No. D2025-3098

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Mohamed Fasal, Mohamed Fasal, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <whatsappapisolutions.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (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 September 16, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 17, 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 September 20, 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 September 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Gökhan Gökçe as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 is WhatsApp LLC, a United States-based technology company operating the widely known WhatsApp messaging and voice-over-IP service and mobile application. Founded in 2009 and acquired by Facebook, Inc. (now Meta Platforms, Inc.) in 2014. The Complainant also provides the WhatsApp Business application and the WhatsApp Business Platform, enabling small and large businesses to interact with customers efficiently through automated tools and programmatic access. The Complainant's platform is offered in approximately sixty languages and consistently ranks among the most-downloaded and most-used mobile applications globally. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the WHATSAPP trademark and operates, among others, the official <whatsapp.com> domain name, as well as multiple domain names incorporating the WHATSAPP trademark.

Complainant has evidenced to be the registered owner of numerous trademarks relating to its company name and brand WHATSAPP, inter alia, but not limited to, the following:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 009986514 for WHATSAPP, registered on October 25, 2011;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1085539 for WHATSAPP, registered on May 24, 2011;
- United States Registration No. 3939463 for WHATSAPP, registered on April 5, 2011,
- Indian Trademark Registration No. 3111463 for WHATSAPP, registered on November 30, 2015.

The Complainant also operates the domain name registered on September 4, 2008, which resolves to the official website for its WhatsApp messaging platform.

The disputed domain names were registered on February 3, 2025.

Pursuant to Annex 18 of the Complaint, on February 10 and 18, 2025, the Complainant sent cease-and-desist e-mails to the Respondent by email. No responses were received.

According to the screenshots attached to the Annex 10 of the Complaint, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website offering an unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's applications and purporting to provide "WhatsApp API Solutions" that allegedly integrate with the Complainant's "Official WhatsApp Cloud API", thereby specifically targeting users of the Complainant's services. The screenshots show prominent use of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademarks and logos, together with marketing statements directed at businesses seeking enhanced customer communication.

However, at the time of the Panel's visit to the disputed domain name, the domain name did not resolve to any such content. Instead, the browser displayed a full-page security warning in Turkish ("Tehlikeli site", "Dangerous Site" in English), indicating that access to the website was unsafe and that no substantive webpage was available.

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 the Complainant's trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations provided in the Complaint as true. See section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

For the evaluation of this case, the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 that the entirety of the WHATSAPP mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition of the term “apisolutions”, which does not prevent a finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark WHATSAPP. 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, “apisolutions” 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.

In what concerns the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [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 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.

In this regard, several circumstances support the Complainant’s prima facie showing:

- There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The underlying Whois information identifies the registrant as “Mohamed fasal”, which bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent has neither acquired nor applied for any trademark corresponding to “WhatsApp API Solutions” or any variation thereof.
- The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has no affiliation, authorization, or relationship with the Complainant. Despite this, the Respondent’s website falsely claims integration with the “Official WhatsApp Cloud API” and prominently displays the Complainant’s WHATSAPP trademarks and logos.

- As evidenced in Annex 10, the Respondent has configured the disputed domain name to resolve to website content that specifically targets the Complainant by offering an unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's applications, whilst making prominent use of the Complainant's trademarks. For example, the website states: "WhatsApp API Solutions integrates with the Official WhatsApp Cloud API, providing a streamlined solution for businesses to enhance customer communication." Such content intentionally creates a false impression of endorsement by the Complainant.
- Use of the Complainant's well-known trademark to promote unauthorized derivative or modified versions of its products cannot constitute bona fide use or legitimate noncommercial use under paragraph 4(c)(i) or 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Respondent has provided no rebuttal or evidence of rights or legitimate interests. On the contrary, the record reflects clear targeting of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark and an intent to mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

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 Complainant's rights in the WHATSAPP trademark predate the registration date of the disputed domain name by years. In light of the above as well as of the well-known character of the WHATSAPP trademark, and of the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark, which supports a finding of bad faith registration.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain name and the nature of the associated website strongly indicate an intent to create a false association with the Complainant. Pursuant to Annex 10, the Respondent's website promotes an unauthorized and modified "WhatsApp API Solutions" application, makes prominent use of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademarks and logos, and contains statements such as "With official verification by Meta...", which falsely suggest endorsement by the Complainant. The website also includes pricing plans for "Whatsapp API Solutions", demonstrating that the Respondent is seeking to commercially benefit from the Complainant's reputation. Such conduct constitutes an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and services, in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See *WhatsApp Inc. v. Rishi Verma*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1562](#).

The Respondent's website also includes a pricing section namely, "Whatsapp API Solutions User Plans", indicating that the Respondent is using the Complainant's well-known WHATSAPP trademark to promote and monetize unauthorized services. This commercial offering is a clear indication 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 WHATSAPP trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such circumstances constitute evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Moreover, the Respondent's failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letters sent by the Complainant and to the current proceeding further supports the finding of bad faith.

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 <whatsappapisolutions.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gökhan Gökçe/

Gökhan Gökçe

Sole Panelist

Date: November 11, 2025