

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WhatsApp LLC v. White Wolves LLC, Aaron Choi
Case No. D2025-3500

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are White Wolves LLC, United States and Aaron Choi, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <gbwatsapp.download> is registered with Dynadot Inc.

The disputed domain names <gbwhatsapp.org>, <gbwhatsappdownload.bar>, <gbwhatsappdownload.net> and <gbwhatsapp.org> are registered with Porkbun LLC.

The disputed domain names <gbwhatsappapk.download> and <gbwhatsapppp.download> are registered with NameSilo, LLC.

Dynadot Inc., Porkbun LLC and NameSilo, LLC. will be referred as the ("Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 28, 2025. On August 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 29, 2025, and September 3, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Whois Privacy Private by Design, LLC, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot, and PrivacyGuardian.org LLC) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity

and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 5, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondents’ default on October 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on October 17, 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 operates a mobile and desktop messaging platform under the WHATSAPP mark. Launched in 2019 and acquired by Meta Platforms, Inc. in 2014, the Complainant’s application has more than 2.8 billion monthly active users and is one of the most downloaded mobile applications. The Complainant is the proprietor of numerous registrations for its trademarks worldwide, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3939463 for WHATSAPP (word mark), registered on April 5, 2011, for services in class 42;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 009986514 for WHATSAPP (word mark), registered on October 25, 2011, for goods and services in classes 9, 38 and 42;
- International Registration No. 1109890 for  (device mark), registered on January 10, 2012, for goods and services in classes 9 and 38.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names comprising its WHATSAPP mark.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows:

1. <gbwhatsap.org> on January 12, 2023;
2. <gbwhatsapp.org> on April 9 2023;
3. <gbwhatsappdownload.bar> on May 14, 2025;
4. <gbwhatsappapk.download> on November 9, 2022;
5. <gbwhatsappp.download> on November 8, 2022;
6. <gbwatsapp.download> on May 16, 2025;
7. <gbwhatsappdownload.net> on April 19, 2023.

The disputed domain names indicated by numerals 1-5 redirect to websites stating “GBWhatsApp APK Download Official”, inviting Internet users to download an “APK” (an abbreviation for “Android Package Kit”) application, stating that this application is a “modified version of the official WhatsApp Messenger, designed for Android devices”. The website features the color green and displays a green icon containing a white circle with an image of a telephone receiver, namely .

The disputed domain name indicated by the numeral 6 previously redirected to the same website. At the time of the Complaint and of this Decision, it was inactive.

The disputed domain name indicated by the numeral 7 redirects to a substantially identical website located at a different domain name.

Under “Terms and Conditions”, the websites indicated by the numerals 1-3 display the following text:

“2. No Affiliation with WhatsApp Inc

GBAPK.org.in is an independent resource and is not affiliated, associated, authorized, endorsed by, or in any way officially connected with WhatsApp Inc. or its parent company, Meta Platforms, Inc. All product and company names are trademarks™ or registered® trademarks of their respective holders.”

The websites indicated by the numerals 4-6 display or displayed the following text:

“2. No Affiliation with GBWhatsApp

This site is not affiliated with the official GBWhatsApp or WhatsApp Inc. Any trademarks or branding used are the property of their respective owners and are used here for identification purposes only.”

The website indicated by the numeral 7 displays the following text:

“WhatsApp Inc. doesn’t officially back GB WhatsApp, so using it might be against their rules. Some users say they were forbidden temporarily or forever after using changed versions of the app.”

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Consolidation of proceedings

The Complainant requests consolidation of proceedings for the following reasons. All seven disputed domain names resolve or redirect (or, in relation to the disputed domain name <gbwatsapp.download>, previously redirected) to websites that purport to offer unauthorized versions of the Complainant’s WhatsApp messaging application for download. All the websites have nearly identical layouts and prominently feature the Complainant’s WHATSAPP mark, as well as variations on the Complainant’s figurative trademark, which also appears as favicons.

The disputed domain names <gbwhatsap.org>, <gbwhatsapp.org> and <gbwhatsappdownload.bar> redirect to the same website at <gbapk.org.in>. The disputed domain names <gbwhatappapk.download>, <gbwhatsapppp.download> and <gbwatsapp.download> redirect, or redirected, to the same website at <gbapk.org.pk>.

The disputed domain names are highly similar in composition, as each includes the Complainant’s WHATSAPP trademark or a misspelling of it, preceded by the letters “gb”. Five of the disputed domain names contain the descriptive term “download” either within the second-level domain or as the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) “.download”.

Each website displays an email address that begins with “contact@”. Four of the disputed domain names were registered with one Registrar; two with another. The registrant information for all the disputed domain names indicates the same telephone number. The registrant organization and registrant email addresses partly overlap.

Requiring the Complainant to file separate complaints would cause the Complainant to incur substantial time and costs.

Substantive 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that its WHATSAPP service is one of the world's most popular mobile messaging applications. The Complainant has made substantial investments in promoting the mark, including through social media, and the mark is both inherently distinctive and well-known throughout the world. All disputed domain names incorporate its WHATSAPP mark in its entirety, or misspellings of it, together with descriptive terms. The Respondents are not licensees of the Complainant, nor are they affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The disputed domain names are being used to offer for download unauthorized modified versions of the Complainant's WhatsApp messaging application in contravention of the terms of the Complainant's messaging service. These websites use a green color scheme and display the Complainant's marks or modified versions thereof. The Respondents cannot be considered bona fide services providers, as they do not provide sales or repairs to a product provided by the Complainant but are using the Complainant's marks for commercial gain. The disclaimer-like statements on the Respondents' websites do not clearly or prominently disclose the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes in particular, the similarity of the naming conventions and the similarity of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve. The Panel also notes that the contact telephone number is the same for all disputed domain names.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

Substantive issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 names. [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 Complainant’s WHATSAPP mark is recognizable within all the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. In addition, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names <gbwhatsapp.org>, <gbwhatsapp.org>, and <gbwhatsapppp.download> contain deliberate misspellings of the Complainant’s WHATSAPP mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms in some or all of the disputed domain names (here, “gb”, “download”, and “apk”) 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 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain names, which comprise the Complainant's established WHATSAPP mark (or misspellings thereof) preceded by the letters "gb" and followed, in some cases, with the descriptive terms "download" or "apk", do not distinguish them from the Mark. Together with the use to which they have been put, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor that there are any circumstances or activities that would establish the Respondent's rights therein. Rather, the disputed domain names resolve to websites purporting to offer the same services as the Complainant, namely, online messaging. Under these circumstances, such use cannot establish rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

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 finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks. The Complainant's rights in its WHATSAPP mark predate the registration of the disputed domain name by at least ten years. The disputed domain names reflect the Complainant's WHATSAPP mark or a misspelling thereof, preceded by the letters "gb" (a common abbreviation for Great Britain) and followed, in some cases, by the term "download" or "apk" (alluding to the Android Package Kit file format). Noting, in addition, the use to which the disputed domain names have been put, the composition of the disputed domain names implies an intention to benefit from the reputation of the Complainant's marks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 this case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names direct or directed Internet users to websites prominently featuring the Complainant's marks (or a misspelling thereof) and purporting to offer for download an application that appears to compete with that of the Complainant. The websites use a green color similar to that used in the Complainant's messaging application, and display a green "telephone" icon similar to that in which the Complainant has trademark rights.

Considering that the Panel finds that the overall circumstances indicate the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, the Respondent's disclaimers do not, in Panel's view, cure bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.7.

Under these circumstances, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <gbwatsapp.download>, <gbwhatsap.org>, <gbwhatsappapk.download>, <gbwhatsappdownload.bar>, <gbwhatsappdownload.net>, <gbwhatsapp.org>, and <gbwhatsappp.download> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: October 30, 2025