

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. louis kuu

Case No. D2025-1947

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 louis kuu, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <fbadsacc.com>, <fb-tk.com>, and <fb-tk.shop> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in connection with the disputed domain names <fb-tk.com> and <fbadsacc.com> with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 15, 2025. On May 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 May 18, 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 the amended Complaint on May 28, 2025, requesting the addition of a new disputed domain name <fb-tk.shop> to the current proceedings.

On May 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the newly added disputed domain name <fb-tk.shop>. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 June 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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, formerly known as Facebook, Inc. is a social technology company which operates the following social media platforms - Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus), and WhatsApp. The Complainant's focus is to bring the metaverse to life and to help people connect, find communities, and grow businesses.

Founded in 2004, the Complainant's Facebook platform, commonly referred to as "FB", enables Internet users to stay connected with friends and family and to share information via its website at "www.facebook.com". Its mobile application is currently ranked as the fourth most downloaded mobile application, according to Data.ai's Top Apps Ranking in 2025.

The Complainant has trade mark registrations for FACEBOOK and FB in various jurisdictions including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 008981383 for FB registered on August 23, 2011;
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 3041791 for FACEBOOK registered on January 10, 2006; and
- Chinese Trade Mark Registration No. 5251162 for FACEBOOK registered on September 21, 2009,

(individually and collectively referred to as the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant also owns and uses a logo and figurative trade mark consisting of the letter "f" (the "Logo Mark") on its website and promotional, marketing and communications material.

The Respondent, who appears to be based in China, registered the disputed domain names on the following dates:

- <fbadsacc.com> on October 4, 2022;
- <fb-tk.com> on October 31, 2023; and
- <fb-tk.shop> on May 27, 2024.

The disputed domain names <fb-tk.com> and <fbadsacc.com> either resolve or redirect to a website in Chinese at "www.fb-tk.com", and the disputed domain name <fb-tk.shop> points to an identical website at "www.fb-tk.shop" (the "Websites"), which purport to sell Facebook accounts through various pricing packages. In addition to Facebook accounts, the Websites also offer for sale Instagram and TikTok accounts. The Websites feature the Trade Marks and displays the Logo Mark alongside the Respondent's WeChat QR code.

On April 2, 2025, the Complainant's representatives submitted Registrar registrant contact form notices for the disputed domain names <fb-tk.com> and <fbadsacc.com> in an attempt to reach out to resolve the matter with the Respondent. No reply was received.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

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 Trade Mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark FB is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the other terms here - "tk" and "adsacc" - may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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.

Moreover, taking into account the website connected to the disputed domain names, the nature of the disputed domain names is misleading, as they effectively impersonate or suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. The inclusion of the terms “tk” and “adsacc”—the latter likely being an abbreviation for “ads account”—immediately following a hyphen after the Complainant’s Trade Mark FB creates a false impression that the disputed domain names are operated or authorized by the Complainant. The addition of terms that carry a risk of user confusion—particularly where they may suggest a business function, platform tool, or official connection—can support a finding of confusing similarity and bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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.

While Facebook is presently inaccessible in mainland China, information about the platform, including how to access it from within China, remains widely available through Chinese press articles, blogs, and online forums. As a result, the Chinese public is also familiar with Facebook. In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Trade Mark when he registered the disputed domain names given the global reputation of the Trade Mark, the use of the Trade Mark and the Logo Mark on the Websites, and the fact that those Websites purportedly offer to sell Facebook accounts. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when he registered the disputed domain names.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

“Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent’s claim not to have been aware of the complainant’s mark.”

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain names without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The disputed domain names fall into the category stated above and the Panel finds that registration is in bad faith.

The disputed domain names are also being used in bad faith. The Websites purportedly offer services which are unauthorized by the Complainant. The Websites display the Trade Mark and the Logo Mark, without any disclaimer disclosing (the lack of) relationship between the Parties. The content of the Websites is calculated to give the impression they have been authorized by or connected to the Complainant when this is not the case. The Websites were set up to deliberately mislead Internet users into believing that they are connected to, authorized by, or affiliated with the Complainant. From the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, by misleading Internet users into believing that the Respondent’s Websites and the services offered on them are those of or authorized or endorsed by the Complainant.

It is highly likely that Internet users when typing the disputed domain names into their browsers or finding them through a search engine would have been looking for a site operated by the Complainant rather than the Respondent. The disputed domain names are likely to confuse Internet users trying to find the Complainant’s official website. Such confusion will inevitably result due to the fact that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 names <fbadsacc.com>, <fb-tk.com>, and <fb-tk.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: July 25, 2025