

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WhatsApp LLC v. Amanda Li
Case No. D2026-0053

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Amanda Li, Singapore.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <www-gbwhatsapp.com> 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 January 7, 2026. On January 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 8, 2026, 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 January 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on February 26, 2026. 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-famous mobile messaging application provider founded in 2009. The Complainant owns many trademark registrations for WHATSAPP such as United States registration No. 3939463, registered on April 5, 2011, and International registration No. 1085539, registered on April 5, 2011.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 10, 2022, and resolves to a website that purports to offer for download an unauthorized modified APK version of the Complainant's WhatsApp.

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 a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Complainant has numerous registrations for the trademark WHATSAPP. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. The addition of the prefix "www" and the letters "gb" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to use its trademark. The disputed domain name is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as the Respondent is using the domain name to offer for download an unauthorized modified APK version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application. The Complainant submits that the Respondent cannot be viewed as a bona fide service provider, as it does not provide sales or repairs in relation to a product provided by the Complainant. Rather, the Respondent is using the Domain Name to purport to offer for download an unauthorized modified APK version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application using the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark. Nevertheless, even if one is to apply the *Oki Data* criteria, the Respondent fails to fulfil the first and third Oki Data criteria, specifically: (a) The Respondent's website purports to offer for download a third-party unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's WhatsApp application; (b) The disclaimer-like statement is placed at the bottom of the page and fails to accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant. Moreover, by making numerous references to the Complainant's WhatsApp platform, as well as featuring a modified version of the Complainant's logos and figurative trademarks, the Respondent's website suggests that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant. The additional functionality provided by the APK version of the WhatsApp application places the privacy and security of WhatsApp users at risk.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name as the website is likely used for commercial gain.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark given its worldwide reputation and its inherent distinctiveness. Actual knowledge is demonstrated through the nature of the Respondent's website as it makes prominent references to the Complainant, its trademark and official application, and features a modified version of the Complainant's WhatsApp logos and figurative trademarks, as well as a green-themed colour scheme similar to that of the Complainant. The Respondent is attempting to create the misleading impression of association with the Complainant. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the

source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website in bad faith. Furthermore, the software being promoted violates the WhatsApp Terms of Service and places the security of WhatsApp users at risk. The disclaimer-like statement does not accurately describe the Respondent's non-affiliation with the Complainant and is not prominently visible, being located at the bottom of the homepage.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "www" and "gb" 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 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 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 must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark as the disputed domain name was registered more than a decade after the registration of the Complainant's trademark and it directs to a page, which purports to offer for download a modified version of the Complainant's application and displays the Complainant's trademark and a modified version of its figurative trademark. The Panel notes the disclaimer but is of the view that it cannot cure the bad faith evidenced by the overall circumstances, including the various elements that suggest affiliation, which are set out above.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <www-gbwhatsapp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: March 3, 2026