

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Starbucks Corporation v. Chaudhry Abbas  
Case No. D2025-4767

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Starbucks Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Focal PLLC, United States.

The Respondent is Chaudhry Abbas, Pakistan, represented by Imran & Associates, United Kingdom.

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

The disputed domain names <starbuckspakistan.co> and <starbucks1usa.com> are registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 18, 2025. On November 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 November 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 11, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 11, 2025,

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on December 13, 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 a world-renowned coffeehouse, established in Seattle, United States, in 1971.

Over the years, the Complainant has seen a vast expansion with stores being opened in Japan, in 1996, Europe, in 1998, and China, in 1999, totaling to date approximately 41097 STARBUCKS stores in 87 markets around the world.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for STARBUCKS, including the following:

- United States trademark registration No. 1372630 for STARBUCKS (word mark), filed on June 3, 1985, and registered on November 26, 1985, in international class 21;
- United States trademark registration No. 1452359 for STARBUCKS (word mark), filed on June 3, 1985, and registered on August 11, 1987, in international class 30;
- United States trademark registration No. 1444549 for STARBUCKS (word mark), filed on June 3, 1985, and registered on June 23, 1987, in international classes 35 and 43;
- United States trademark registration No. 3259720 for STARBUCKS (word mark), filed on April 29, 2004, and registered on July 10, 2007, in international class 38;
- United States trademark registration No. 3330858 for STARBUCKS (word mark), filed on February 15, 2005, and registered on November 6, 2007, in international class 35;
- United States trademark registration No. 3907156 for STARBUCKS (word mark), filed on May 4, 2010, and registered on January 18, 2011, in international classes 35 and 42.



The Complainant is also the owner of trademark registrations for , STARBUCKS COFFEE, such as the United States trademark registration No. 3298945, filed on February 15, 2005, and registered on September 25, 2007, in international class 30; and 78567731, filed on February 15, 2005, and registered on May 13, 2008, in class 35.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <starbucks.com>, which was registered on October 25, 1993, and is used by the Complainant to promote its products and services under the trademark STARBUCKS and STARBUCKS COFFEE.

The disputed domain names <starbuckspakistan.co> and <starbucks1usa.com> were registered on March 29, 2022, and March 30, 2022, and resolve to static "coming soon" pages, displayed at "www.starbucks1usa.pk" and "www.starbucks1usa.com" respectively, which publish a slightly varied version of the Complainant's figurative mark, including the addition of a number "1" after the denominative element "starbucks", a number "1" below the face of the female figure in the logo, and the words "drinks" and "snacks" after the term "coffee". The logo also includes the registered trademark symbol ®, as follows:



The webpage to which the disputed domain name <starbucks1usa.com> resolves, available at “www.starbucks1usa.com”, lists the Respondent as CEO and includes, under the heading “Official Address”, the contact details of a “USA Head Office” located in New Jersey, United States, and of a Pakistan Office located in Islamabad, Pakistan.

## **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark STARBUCKS in which the Complainant has rights as they both reproduce the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition, in one case, of the geographical indicator “pakistan” and in the other, of the number “1” followed by the geographical indicator “usa”, besides the country code Top-Level domain (“ccTLD”) “.co” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”.

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since: i) the Complainant’s rights in the STARBUCKS mark long predate the registration of the disputed domain names; ii) the Complainant’s reputation and goodwill in the STARBUCKS brand as one of the world’s largest coffeehouse chains is clearly established; iii) the Respondent is in no way affiliated with the Complainant nor has it ever been authorized by the Complainant to use its registered trademarks in any way; iv) the disputed domain names are not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services as they resolve to websites that use the Complainant’s intellectual property in the website content in order to deceptively suggest an endorsement by or affiliation with the Complainant that does not exist; and v) the content of the websites clearly suggest that the sites were intended to be solely used for commercial purposes.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in bad faith because: i) the Complainant’s rights in the STARBUCKS marks long predate the registration of the disputed domain names and ii) the disputed domain names are so obviously connected with Complainant, that their use by the Respondent which is in no way connected or affiliated with the Complainant suggests opportunistic bad faith.

### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent denies all the Complainant’s allegations and points out that this is not the proper forum for resolving the present dispute because: i) both parties possess legitimate claims to trademarks and business names; ii) the Respondent did not target the Complainant, as they both operate in different jurisdictions; and iii) UDRP panels hold that where there are competing trademark rights, the dispute falls outside the scope of the Policy.

Specifically, the Respondent argues that the disputed domain names are not confusingly similar to the Complainant’s STARBUCKS mark since: i) the additions of “1usa” and “pakistan” are not minor and on the contrary, changes the meaning, scope, function, impression and commercial concerns of the business; ii) the Complainant’s mark is not used “as-is” but as a distinct combined brand identity and the disputed domain names represent a distinct combined brand identity; iii) the Respondent’s independent logo, corporate name and trademark filings support distinctiveness and iv) the Respondent’s separate logo supports distinctiveness.

The Respondent claims it has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain names since it made bona fide preparations to use the disputed domain names before notice of the dispute, including:

- i) Incorporating the United States company Starbucks1 USA-PK LLC in New Jersey on March 21, 2022;
- ii) Filing the New Jersey Trademark registration No. 27402 for the figurative mark STARBUCKS1 USA-PK, on December 24, 2024, claiming first use as of March 21, 2022;
- iii) Incorporating the Pakistan company Starbucks1 USA-PK (Private) Limited in Islamabad on April 7, 2025;
- iv) Filing a trademark application for the logo displayed on the Respondent's websites, on July 1, 2025 for goods in class 30.

The Respondent also states that it is commonly known by the disputed domain names and, considering the Complainant has no presence in Pakistan, consumers cannot be confused as to the origin of the Respondent's business. The Respondent also claims that the Complainant provided no proof that the registration or use was intended to exploit or misappropriate the Complainant's goodwill and that the Complainant also failed to highlight any offer to sell or transfer the disputed domain names to the Complainant or its competitors.

With reference to bad faith registration and use, the Respondent rebuts all contentions stating that i) the Respondent did not intend to target the Complainant; ii) Respondent's business is geographically distinct; iii) the Complainant does not operate in Pakistan; iv) there is no evidence of intent to exploit the Complainant's goodwill; v) the Respondent made no offer to sell the disputed domain names; vi) the disputed domain names were not misleadingly redirected and vii) there was no intention to disrupt the business of a competitor.

The Respondent also contends that the Complainant has no trademark rights in Pakistan, has provided no evidence of reputation or of presence in Pakistan and has not presented any evidence of targeting.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to 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." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain names registered by the Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of valid trademark registrations for STARBUCKS.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within 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.

Although the addition of the term “Pakistan”, the number “1” and the term “usa” (which may be interpreted as an abbreviation of “United States of America”) may be relevant for assessing 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.

In addition, the gTLD “.com” and the ccTLD “.co” can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test, being standard registration requirements. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 rebutted the Complainant’s *prima facie* showing but came forward with insufficient evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee, authorized reseller or distributor of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s trademarks.

The Respondent claims to have rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and, particularly, to be commonly known by the disputed domain names and to have made bona fide preparations to use them before receiving notice of the dispute. Indeed, the Respondent asserts to have registered the disputed domain names for use in connection with its new up and coming business based in Pakistan, asserting that it has rights or legitimate interests since the Complainant has no registered trademark rights in said country.

As highlighted in section 5.B above, the Respondent relies on i) the incorporation in the United States of a company Starbucks1 USA-PK LLC in New Jersey on March 21, 2022; ii) the filing of a New Jersey Trademark registration for the figurative mark STARBUCKS1 USA-PK, dated on December 24, 2024 and claiming first use as of March 21, 2022; iii) the incorporation in Pakistan of a company named Starbucks1 USA-PK (Private) Limited on April 7, 2025; and iv) the filing of a trademark application in Pakistan for the logo displayed on the Respondent's websites, dated July 1, 2025, for goods in class 30.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has provided what appears to be evidence of a company incorporated in Pakistan, but the incorporation of a company without further evidence of a legitimate business cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3. The Respondent may have incorporated such a business effectively, but the Panel notes that the Respondent did not provide relevant evidence showing a legitimate business for the purposes of the Policy. On the contrary, the circumstances of the case point towards the Respondent attempting to take an unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation or to create an impression of affiliation with the Complainant.

Moreover, the existence of a respondent's trademark which corresponds to a disputed domain name does not necessarily establish rights or legitimate interests in the corresponding domain name for the purpose of the second element of the Policy, where the overall circumstances demonstrate that such trademark rights were obtained primarily to circumvent the application of the Policy or otherwise prevent the complainant's exercise of its rights, even if only in a particular jurisdiction. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.12.2.

In the case at hand, the Panel notes that the Respondent has not provided any explanations about the rationale of its selection and use of the disputed domain names, purported company names and purported marks encompassing the Complainant's registered and well-known mark STARBUCKS and its use of a logo which clearly recalls the figurative mark of the Complainant for promotion of the Respondent's purportedly independent business, which on the contrary the Panel finds unquestionably suggest endorsement by or affiliation with Complainant.

Moreover, the disputed domain names have been both redirected to coming soon pages displaying a logo which incorporates the STARBUCKS word mark and is very similar to the Complainant's figurative mark STARBUCKS COFFEE, including also the wording "coffee, drinks, snacks". Furthermore, the webpage to which the disputed domain name <starbucks1usa.com> resolves provides contact information of a "USA Head Office" and a "Pakistan Office". In the Panel's view, the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's marks and its intention to give the impression of an affiliation with the Complainant could not be more evident. Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that the fact that the Complainant has not provided evidence of trademark rights for STARBUCKS in Pakistan is not sufficient for the Respondent to prevail, particularly noting the global reach of the Internet.

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain names in connection with the web pages described above is apt to cause confusion amongst Internet users as to the source or affiliation of the Respondent's websites and, therefore, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intention to misleadingly divert Internet users or to tarnish the Complainant's trademarks. Indeed, considering the well-known character of the Complainant's mark STARBUCKS, the Panel finds that this is not a trademark that traders could legitimately adopt other than for creating an impression of association with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the disputed domain names, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark STARBUCKS with the addition of the geographical terms "usa" and "pakistan" and the number "1", are inherently misleading and suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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, i) in light of the prior registration and use of the trademark STARBUCKS by the Complainant in the United States and several other countries; ii) the promotion of the Complainant's trademark online via the website "www.starbucks.com"; and iii) the distinctiveness and well-known character of the Complainant's famous trademark worldwide, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Indeed, the Panel finds the Respondent acted in opportunistic bad faith at the time of registering the disputed domain names, since the disputed domain names are so obviously connected with the Complainant and the STARBUCKS mark that their very selection by the Respondent, which has no connection with the Complainant, suggests the disputed domain names were registered with a deliberate intent to create an impression of an association with the Complainant.

The disputed domain names resolve to "coming soon" pages, publishing a slightly varied but highly recognizable version of the Complainant's figurative mark STARBUCKS COFFEE. In addition, the webpage to which the disputed domain name <starbucks1usa.com> resolves, includes contact information, displayed under the heading "Official Address", of a purported "USA Head Office" as well as of a "Pakistan Office". The Panel finds that the content of the webpages clearly shows the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks and its intention to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion and association with the Complainant and its trademarks.

As stated in section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Panels have moreover found that the respondent seeking to cause confusion for the respondent's commercial benefit, the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, and the absence of any conceivable good faith use may support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

### **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 <starbuckspakistan.co> and <starbucks1usa.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

**Luca Barbero**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 6, 2026