

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WhatsApp, LLC v. Muhammad Ramzan
Case No. D2025-3681

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Muhammad Ramzan, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gbwhatsappdownloadoldversion.info> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 11, 2025. On September 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 12, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 16, 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 September 19, 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 September 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 15, 2025.


The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on October 21, 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 the provider of the mobile messaging application WHATSAPP, with over two billion users in over 180 countries.

The Complainant owns a large portfolio of WHATSAPP marks registered in different jurisdictions. By way of example:

- United States trademark registration No. 3939463, registered on April 5, 2011;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 009986514, registered on October 25, 2011;
- International trademark registration No. 1085539, registered on May 24, 2011, designating various jurisdictions worldwide.

Moreover, the Complainant holds an International trademark registration for its logo  with registration No. 1109890, registered January 10, 2012, designating various jurisdictions worldwide.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 24, 2023, and resolves to a web page that offers a modified version of the Complainant's application while using a modified version of its logo and the Complainant's WHATSAPP mark.

The Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent in December 2023 and January 2024 through the webform provided by the Registrar. However, no response was received.

The Respondent has been involved in previous UDRP cases with the Complainant where panels ordered the transfer of the disputed domain name in every case. As such, see *WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Ramzan*, WIPO Case D2025-2718; *WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Ramzan*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2025-0009](#); and *WhatsApp LLC v. Muhammad Ramzan*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0340](#).

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 none of the circumstances depicted in paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy applies. Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name coupled with the website content and favicon displaying a logo that is confusingly similar to Complainant's WHATSAPP design mark entails a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant or at least it gives the impression of an association with the Complainant.

The Complainant alleges that the Oki Data test does not apply in this case. By offering a modified unauthorized version of the Complainant's WHATSAPP app, the Respondent is not giving rise to any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since there is a breach of its Terms of Use. These terms of use apply to all users of Complainant's platforms, including software developers like the Respondent with applications or services integrated with the Complainant's platforms, and expressly prohibit the Respondent from using the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name. Therefore, it is impossible for the Respondent to provide any bona fide services as understood within Oki Data test.

However, alleges the Complainant, even accepting that Oki Data test applies, the Respondent is not providing bona fide services under the first, third and fourth factors of the test.

With regard to the third requirement of the Policy, the Complainant contends that WHATSAPP Trademarks are inherently distinctive and well-known. Thus, the Respondent knew or should have known them and makes it impossible to ignore them when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name and the website content to which it diverts implies confusion and determines that the circumstances in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy are met.

Finally, the Respondent's pattern of targeting the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademarks by registering multiple domain names is further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark 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 was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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" and "downloadoldversion" may bear an 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 Panel notes that none of the circumstances described in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy can be inferred from the file.

Notably, the Panel finds that the Respondent is offering a modified version of the Complainant’s WHATSAPP app purporting to be “a better version of the WhatsApp app, with many more features”. Besides, the Respondent is using a modified version of the Complainant’s trademark rights on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves. From all this, the Panel infers that the Respondent is marketing his own services and, therefore there is no bona fide offering of goods or services because the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its trademarks seemingly to take unfair advantage of the inherent confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name.

Thus, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks legitimate rights or interests.

The Panel also looks at [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8 and finds that the Respondent is offering his own services, competitive to the Complainant’s. Accordingly, the Oki Data test does not play here.

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 did not publish a disclaimer on the website to which the disputed domain resolves but did publish a modified version of Complainant’s logo and trademarks. This allows the Panel to conclude that paragraph 4(b)(iv) applies since the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark which constitutes bad faith use.

Besides, the Panel finds that paragraph 4 (b)(iii) also applies in this case. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.3: “Noting that the scenarios enumerated in UDRP paragraph 4(b) are non-exhaustive, panels have applied the notion of a ‘competitor’ beyond the concept of an ordinary commercial or business competitor to also include the concept of ‘a person who acts in opposition to another’ for some means of commercial gain, direct or otherwise”. Here and according to the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that the Respondent is disrupting the Complainant’s business.

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.

On balance, the Panel concludes that the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name due to their well-established reputation and distinctiveness, as well as the current use of the disputed domain name. Therefore, the registration and use was in bad faith.

Further, the Panel also notes the absence of rights and legitimate interests for the Respondent, as well as the Respondent's previous serial cybersquatter cases, which also support the conclusion of bad faith registration and use by the Respondent.

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 <gbwhatsappdownloadoldversion.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: November 4, 2025