

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Taimur Ejaz, NewPakWeb
Case No. D2026-0153

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Meta Platforms, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Perkins Coie, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Taimur Ejaz, NewPakWeb, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <savefbreels.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 14, 2026. On January 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 16, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 16, 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 amendment to the Complaint on January 21, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 25, 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, founded in 2004, is a leading provider of online social media and social networking services. The Complainant owns many trademark registrations for FB such as:

- European Union registration No. 018146501, registered on November 7, 2020;
- Brazilian registration No. 918596068, registered on August 18, 2020; and
- United Kingdom registration No. 00003441474, registered on March 20, 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 2, 2024, and resolves to a website that offers tools to purportedly download content from the Complainant's platform FACEBOOK. There is a disclaimer on the website stating that the website is not affiliated with the Complainant.

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 the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for FACEBOOK and FB. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark FB with the addition of the terms "save" and "reels". The addition of the term "save" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The addition of the word "reels" adds to the confusing similarity because it designates a feature of the Complainant's social media platforms. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" may be disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence to suggest that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. 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 offers tools to purportedly download content from Complainant's platforms. The Respondent clearly had Complainant's trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain name in order to exploit and profit from those rights. The *Oki Data* test does not apply as the Complainant's Terms of Services prohibit the use of the Complainant's trademarks. Assuming *arguendo* that the *Oki Data* test could apply, Respondent is not providing bona fide services as understood within the *Oki Data* test under the first, second, and third elements.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark FACEBOOK is well-known, and FB is a well-known abbreviation of the Complainant's trademark FACEBOOK. The Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks. In choosing a domain name that so closely resembles the Complainant's FB trademark to promote an unauthorized, derivative, competing service, the Respondent is taking advantage of a complainant's mark for commercial gain, which supports a finding of bad faith. By using the disputed domain name in this fashion, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The Respondent's unauthorized downloader services may be used to spread malware, to enable spam, to

harvest personal data from the Complainant's platform, to steal users' account credentials, or for other illegal activities. The Respondent never replied to correspondence from the Complainant. The Respondent's use of a proxy service constitutes additional evidence of bad faith

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal reply to the Complainant's contentions. In an email of February 25, 2026, Respondent simply wrote "Who are you people and what do you want me to do?"

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, "save" and "reels", 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 Complainant's trademark is well-known and as the disputed domain name was registered few years after the registration of the Complainant's trademark. Additionally, the disputed domain name directs to a page, which purports to offer tools to download content from the Complainant's FACEBOOK platform.

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.

The evidence shows that the Respondent's intent in registering and using the disputed domain name was to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the FB trademark as to the source or endorsement of the platform featured on the Respondent's website. The Panel notes the disclaimer on the website, however as stated in section 3.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), where the overall circumstances of a case point to the respondent's bad faith, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith.

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 <savefbreels.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/
Nayiri Boghossian
Sole Panelist
Date: March 4, 2026