

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. 文 桂 (Gui Wen)

Case No. D2025-0534

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 文 桂 (Gui Wen), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <metasstore.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 February 10, 2025. On February 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 11, 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 February 14, 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 February 19, 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 February 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on March 20, 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., is a United States social technology company that operates, among others, the well-known platforms Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus), and WhatsApp. In 2022, the Complainant opened a physical retail space known as the “Meta Store” in California, designed to showcase and allow customers to experience its hardware products. The Complainant owns numerous domain names comprising or including its META mark and maintains a significant social media presence, with 13.7 million followers on X.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following registered trademarks:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 5548121, META, assigned to the Complainant on October 28, 2021;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 018686894, META, registered on July 14, 2023.

The disputed domain name <metasstore.com> was registered on September 25, 2023. The disputed domain name resolves to a website titled “Meta Store Give You A Whole New Shopping Experience”, which appears to operate as an online marketplace offering a variety of third-party products, including books, jewellery, electronics, and watches. According to the “Term Conditions” page of the website, the site is operated by “Meta Store”. Notably, the bottom of the homepage displays the Complainant’s physical address: “1601 Willow Road Menlo Park, 94025. United States”.

The Complainant’s legal representatives submitted the Registrar’s registrant contact form in an attempt to reach the Respondent and resolve the matter amicably, but no reply was received. No further information is available regarding the Respondent.

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 trademark in the disputed domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s mark.

The Complainant further asserts that the addition of the letter “s” and the term “store” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the META mark remains clearly recognisable in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, and has not been authorised to use the mark in any capacity.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent is falsely presenting itself as the Complainant, or as affiliated with it, in an attempt to pass itself off as a legitimate provider of retail services.

The Complainant highlights the absence of any evidence that the Respondent has acquired or applied for trademark registrations for META or any variation thereof.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, as its composition itself cannot constitute fair use where it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

Emphasising the well-established reputation of its mark, as recognised by previous UDRP panels, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent could not credibly claim to have been unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Finally, the Complainant draws attention to the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's outreach via the Registrar's online contact form, viewing this silence as further indicative of bad faith registration and use.

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, such as the letter "s" and the word "store", 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.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is neither a licensee of the Complainant nor otherwise affiliated with it, and there is no indication of any authorisation that would permit the Respondent to make use of the Complainant's trademark, whether in a domain name or in any other context.

The Respondent's website, which is entitled "Meta Store Give You A Whole New Shopping Experience", claims to be operated by an entity referred to as "Meta Store". This claimed identity, when considered together with the structure of the disputed domain name, is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated by, or otherwise connected with, the Complainant.

The composition of the disputed domain name reinforces this misleading impression. It incorporates the Complainant's mark, alongside the letter "s" and the generic term "store", which may readily be interpreted by users as a reference either to the Complainant's physical retail outlet or to its official online store. Compounding this misrepresentation, the Respondent's website prominently displays the Complainant's physical business address, further enhancing the misleading impression of a direct connection or endorsement by the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Respondent's name bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has acquired or sought to acquire any trademark rights in "meta" or any variation thereof.

In this case, the combined elements of the Respondent's presentation, the structure of the disputed domain name, the display of the Complainant's physical address, and the absence of any legitimate basis for its use, collectively support the conclusion that the Respondent is seeking to benefit from an unauthorised association with the Complainant and thus lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Prior UDRP panels have consistently recognised the strength and renown of the Complainant's trademark. At the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant's trademark was already registered and widely used, and the Panel considers it clear that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

The composition of the disputed domain name, which may readily be interpreted as referring to either the Complainant's physical retail store or its electronic store, strongly supports the inference that the Respondent sought to exploit the Complainant's reputation. These factors lead the Panel to conclude that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, with the deliberate intention of creating a misleading association with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Respondent's ongoing use of the disputed domain name perpetuates this misleading impression. The deliberate use of the Complainant's trademark within the disputed domain name, combined with the display of the Complainant's address, confirms that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith to attract Internet users for its own commercial gain.

Moreover, the Respondent's employment of a privacy or proxy service, in circumstances where it appears to have been used primarily to avoid notification of UDRP proceedings, further supports a finding of 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.

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 <metasstore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: April 8, 2025