

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WhatsApp LLC v. Isdd Tech
Case No. D2026-1820

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Isdd Tech, Israel.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <whatsappsignals.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 28, 2026. On April 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 2026, 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 (Data Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 1, 2026, 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 May 6, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint/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 May 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Anne-Virginie La Spada as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 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 provider of one of the world's most popular mobile messaging applications. Founded in 2009 and acquired by Meta Platforms, Inc. (formerly known as Facebook, Inc.) in 2014, WhatsApp allows users across the globe to exchange messages for free via smartphones, including iPhone and Android.

The Complainant operates a website available at "www.whatsapp.com" that also allows Internet users to access its messaging platform. The Complainant registered the domain name <whatsapp.com> on September 4, 2008.

The Complainant owns in particular the following trademark registrations for WHATSAPP:

- United States of America trademark registration No. 3939463, registered on April 5, 2011 in class 42;
- European Union trademark registration No. 009986514, registered on October 25, 2011 in classes 9, 38 and 42;
- International registration No. 1085539, registered on May 24, 2011 in classes 9 and 38, designating inter alia Israel.

The Complainant also own trademark registrations for its figurative logo consisting of a green speech bubble with a white telephone in the center.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 9, 2020.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website titled "WhatsApp SIGNALS" that purportedly offered a subscription-based trading alert service, called WhatsApp Signals, that sends users trading alerts (described as "buy or sell suggestions of a specific security") via WhatsApp. The Respondent's website offered various paid packages. Internet users were prompted to create an account and to login to purchase a package or to use the free trial to receive the trading alerts via WhatsApp.

The Respondent's website displayed the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark in a prominent manner and featured a green and white logo in the form of a speech bubble that is similar to the Complainant's logo.

The Respondent's website did not feature any disclaimer-style wording as to a lack of relationship with the Complainant.

The Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the registrant of the disputed domain name on March 17, 2026. The Complainant did not receive any reply.

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 presence of its WHATSAPP trademark in the disputed domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. The addition of the term "signals" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark, which remains clearly recognizable.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its WHATSAPP trademark in the disputed domain name or otherwise. The Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent is making unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark in an attempt to drive Internet users to the Respondent's website, where they are prompted to subscribe to the Respondent's own commercial services. The Complainant submits that the Respondent clearly derives monetary gain from its use of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Given the renown of the Complainant's trademark existing long before the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. In the Complainant's view, the nature of the Respondent's website clearly demonstrates actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark, as the website makes prominent reference to the Complainant and its WHATSAPP trademark and features a logo and favicon that is very similar to the Complainant's logo. With respect to use, the Complainant contends that in view of the Respondent's website featuring prominently the WHATSAPP trademark, it may be inferred that the Respondent is seeking to target the Complainant's trademarks to create an impression of association with the Complainant and drive Internet users to purchasing the subscription packages. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent is intentionally attempting 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, affiliation or endorsement of the website, in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must assert and prove each of the following:

- (i) the domain name registered by the respondent 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name registered by the respondent has been 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 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 another term (here, "signals") 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 3.1](#), 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 indeed observes the absence of any element on the record suggesting that the Respondent is commonly known under the disputed domain name or that it has been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark WHATSAPP in the disputed domain name. The Panel further observes that the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a website that prominently displayed the Complainant's trademark to promote the Respondent's own services, in a manner that suggests affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant. This does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complaint. The Panel may draw from the lack of a Response the inferences that it considers appropriate, according to the Rules, paragraph 14(b).

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent used on its website the Complainant's trademark WHATSAPP and its figurative logo, which have been widely used before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel accepts therefore that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the use of a disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of a web site or location or of a product or service on the website or location, amounts to evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

In the present case, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a website displaying prominently the Complainant's WHATSAPP trademark and using a logo very similar to the Complainant's logo. Such use was apt to create the false impression that the Respondent's website was operated or endorsed by the Complainant. The absence of any disclaimer on the Respondent's website regarding the lack of a relationship with the Complainant was apt to increase the risk of confusion. Consequently, by using the disputed domain name in such manner to offer its own paid services, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source and affiliation of its website. Such behavior constitutes use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <whatsappsignals.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anne-Virginie La Spada/

Anne-Virginie La Spada

Sole Panelist

Date: June 19, 2026