

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Mavv Jizzwadd Jizzus
Case No. D2025-4261

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 Mavv Jizzwadd Jizzus, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <facebookaccounts.com> 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 October 17, 2025. On October 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 17, 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 October 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 23, 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on November 24, 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, Meta Platforms, Inc., (Meta) is a United States social technology company, and operates, *inter alia*, Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus) and WhatsApp. Founded in 2004, the Complainant's Facebook platform (Facebook) is a leading provider of online social-media and social-networking services. Since its launch in 2004, Facebook rapidly developed considerable renown and goodwill worldwide, with 1 million active users by the end of 2004, 100 million users in August 2008, 500 million users in July 2010 and 1 billion users worldwide by September 2012. Facebook had 2.27 billion monthly active users by September 2018 and 2.8 billion by December 2020. Today, Facebook has approximately 3.07 billion monthly active users and 2.11 billion daily active users on average worldwide (as of May 8, 2025).

In addition to its strong online presence, the Complainant has secured ownership of trademark registrations for FACEBOOK in a number of jurisdictions, including but not limited to the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3,734,637, FACEBOOK, registered on January 5, 2010;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 005585518, FACEBOOK, registered on May 25, 2011; and
- International Registration No. 1075807, FACEBOOK, registered on July 16, 2010.

The Complainant was recently made aware of the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, registered on August 3, 2024, comprising the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark followed by the term "accounts" under the generic Top-Level Domain ".com". The disputed domain name redirects to a blank page. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the disputed domain name has never resolved to an active website.

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

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. 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 FACEBOOK trademark, in a domain name or otherwise.

There is no evidence of the Respondent having made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, such as evidence of business formation-related due diligence/legal advice/correspondence, evidence of credible investment in website development or promotional materials such as advertising, letterhead, or business cards, or proof of a genuine (i.e., not pretextual) business plan utilizing the disputed domain name or other evidence generally pointing to a lack of indicia of cybersquatting intent.

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, "accounts," 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 3.0](#), 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 finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <facebookaccounts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/
Elizabeth Ann Morgan
Sole Panelist
Date: December 8, 2025