

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc v. Shahin Hosting
Case No. D2025-2683

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Shahin Hosting, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cheapfbstore.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 8, 2025. On July 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 15, 2025.

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 July 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 6, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Anna Carabelli as the sole panelist in this matter on August 11, 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 and operates, inter alia, Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp.

Since its launch in 2004, the Complainant's Facebook platform ("Facebook") has developed considerable renown worldwide. Commonly referred to as "FB", it is one of the leading providers of online social networking services, with over three billion monthly active users and over two billion daily active users on average worldwide. Facebook's social networking services are provided in more than seventy languages and are available also for mobile devices.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for FACEBOOK and FB in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States trademark registration No. 3734637, FACEBOOK, registered on January 5, 2010 (date of first use claimed: February 4, 2004);
- European Union trademark registration No. 005585518, FACEBOOK, registered on May 25, 2011;
- International trademark registration No. 1075094, FACEBOOK (figurative), registered on July 16, 2010;
- European Union trademark registration No. 018146501, FB, registered on November 7, 2020 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the FACEBOOK Marks);

The Complainant also owns figurative trademark registrations for a blue and white f - favicon, including:

- European Union trademark registration No. 17996790, registered on February 22, 2020;
- United States trademark registration No. 4978379, registered on June 14, 2016. (hereinafter collectively referred to as the Figurative Marks).

The disputed domain name was registered on December 4, 2017 and resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's FACEBOOK Marks and Figurative Marks, and allegedly offering to sell "Cheap Facebook Marketing Service" including "Likes", "Stars", "Post Likes" and "Followers" on the Complainant's Facebook platform.

In November 2024, the Complainant sent to the Respondent (through the Contact Domain Owner webform provided by the Registrar) notification letters requesting the Respondent to cease all unauthorized use of the Complainant's marks and to transfer the disputed domain name, a request to which the Respondent did not comply.

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 Complainant's FACEBOOK Marks as well as the Complainant's Figurative Marks are highly distinctive and renowned globally;
- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FB mark;

- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since:
 - (i) the Respondent has not been authorized or somehow given consent by the Complainant to register and use the disputed domain name, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; (ii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and to capitalize on the Complainant's considerable goodwill and reputation, to attract for commercial gain Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademarks.
- The Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith registration and use since it appears to have targeted in bad faith not only the Complainant's famous FACEBOOK Marks, but also at least one other trademark of a third-party brand owner. The Respondent's domain names listed in Complainant's reverse-Whois search show that the Respondent's modus operandi is to: register domain names incorporating trademarks of third-party companies; hold domains passively until deciding to trade-off the goodwill of those marks for commercial gain.

Based on the above the Complainant requests the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to decide the complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four illustrative circumstances, which for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances any one of which, if found by the Panel, shall be evidence of the Respondent's rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy above.

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 FB mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. 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 “cheap” and “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 addition of the Top-Level Domain, such as “.com” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 composition of the disputed domain name (comprising of the Complainant’s FB mark) creates a risk of confusion and implied affiliation with the Complainant, contrary to the fact. Further, the disputed domain name is being used for a website allegedly offering to sell “Cheap Facebook Marketing Service”. There is not any disclaimer on the website disclosing the (lack of) relationship between the Parties. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and therefore does not give rise to rights and legitimate interests of the Respondent 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 Complainant’s FB mark has been continuously and extensively used globally for many years and has, as a result, acquired considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide. In view of the well-known character of the FB mark, as well as the FACEBOOK and FIGURATIVE Marks, it

is difficult to believe that the Respondent did not have in mind the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain name. Prior panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Indeed, in the specific case, the content of the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name establishes both the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights and the Respondent's intention to take unfair advantage of those rights.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website allegedly offering cheap Facebook marketing services, including "Likes" and "Followers", without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant. Rather, by displaying the Complainant's distinctive Figurative Marks, and making explicit reference to "Facebook", the Respondent's website may mislead Internet users into thinking that the Respondent's website and the services provided therein are endorsed or permitted by the Complainant. Thus, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has used the confusingly similar disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website.

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 <cheapfbstore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anna Carabelli/

Anna Carabelli

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2025