

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. xiaodong liu

Case No. D2025-3786

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is xiaodong liu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <metasuperintelligencelabs.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 17, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 19, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 22, 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 October 7, 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 October 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on November 12, 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 United States social technology company. In 2025, the Complainant launched a new artificial intelligence project called Meta Superintelligence Labs. The project was reported as of June 10, 2025, by the New York Times. The Complainant owns many trademark registrations for META such as:

- Andorran Trademark Registration No. 43626, registered on January 3, 2022;
- Monaco Trademark Registration No. 2200039, registered on February 8, 2022; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 018686894, registered on July 14, 2023.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 30, 2025, and is offered for sale for the amount of USD 17,000.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for META. The addition of the terms "superintelligence" and "labs" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's trademark remains recognizable. 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 using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to use its trademark in the disputed domain name nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant or is it a licensee of the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that is offered for sale, which is not a bona fide use. There is no evidence of the Respondent having made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name as there is no evidence to suggest so. The name of the Respondent was redacted. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name as it is offered for sale and the composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark META is well known and the change of the Complainant's name attracted significant media attention internationally. Prior UDRP panels have recognized the strength of the Complainant's trademark. The terms "superintelligence" and "labs" may be read as a reference to the Complainant's initiative. The Respondent had the Complainant's trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The price at which the disputed domain name is being offered for sale supports an inference of bad faith.

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 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, "superintelligence" and "labs," 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 3.0](#), 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.

While the resale of domain names consisting of acronyms, dictionary words, or common phrases can be *bona fide* and is not *per se* illegitimate under the UDRP, here the Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive and well-known trademark, contains terms that refer to the Complainant's project, was registered couple of years after the registration of the trademark, and is offered for sale at a price likely to exceed the Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses, absent evidence to the contrary.

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 includes the terms "superintelligence" and "labs", which refer to the Complainant's project, the Complainant's trademark is well known, and the disputed domain name was registered couple of years after the registration of the Complainant's trademark and couple of weeks after the Complainant's project was announced.

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.

The Panel finds applicable the circumstances set out in UDRP paragraph 4(b)(i), namely that "The respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name".

This conclusion is drawn from the fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name couple of years after the Complainant's registration of the trademark and couple of weeks after the Complainant's project was announced and has offered it for sale for a price likely exceeding the Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses, absent evidence from the Respondent to the contrary.

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 <metasuperintelligencelabs.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/
Nayiri Boghossian
Sole Panelist
Date: November 20, 2025