

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Meta Support, Meta, and Support Meta, Support Meta Case No. D2025-2910

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Meta Platforms, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondents are Meta Support, Meta, Viet Nam, and Support Meta, Support Meta, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <noreply-facebookmail.com>, <noreply-security-facebookmail.com>, and <support-verification-facebookmail.com> (“the Domain Names”) are registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 22, 2025 regarding the Domain Name <support-verification-facebookmail.com>. On July 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with this Domain Name. On July 23, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for this Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Meta) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 24, 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 first amended Complaint on August 4, 2025, requesting to add the Domain Names <noreply-facebookmail.com> and <noreply-security-facebookmail.com> to the proceedings. On August 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with these additional Domain Names. On August 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for these additional Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Meta Support, Meta) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the Domain Names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all Domain Names are under common control. The second amended Complaint was filed on August 12, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 7, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 8, 2025. After the Center's notification email, the Respondent "Support Meta, Support Meta" sent email communications to the Center on September 8, 2025, and September 9, 2025, respectively.

The Center appointed Mauricio Jalife Daher as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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, which operates Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest and WhatsApp.

The Facebook platform was founded in 2004. It is a leading provider of online social-media and social-networking services. FACEBOOK is a renowned trademark worldwide. The platform has approximately 3.07 billion monthly active users on average worldwide (as of December 31, 2023). Facebook's social-networking services are provided in more than 70 languages, and in recent years has consistently ranked amongst the top "apps" in the market. In 2024, the FACEBOOK brand ranked 21st in Interbrand's Best Global Brands report. The Complainant has made substantial investments to develop a strong presence online by being active on various social-media platforms. The Complainant's official page on Facebook has over 94 million followers.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for FACEBOOK throughout the world, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3,041,791, FACEBOOK, registered on January 10, 2006;
- Vietnamese Trademark Registration No. 4-0128158-000, FACEBOOK, registered on June 26, 2009;
- European Union Trademark No. 005585518, FACEBOOK, registered on May 25, 2011; and
- International Registration No. 1075807, FACEBOOK, registered on July 16, 2010.

The Domain Names were created on the following dates:

- <noreply-facebookmail.com>, November 15, 2023;
- <noreply-security-facebookmail.com>, July 28, 2024; and
- <support-verification-facebookmail.com>, August 4, 2024.

Each of the Domain Names currently resolves to an inactive web page.

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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the presence of its FACEBOOK trademark in the Domain Names is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant's trademark. The addition of the terms "noreply", "support", "verification", "security" and "mail", as well as the use of hyphens, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark.

The Respondent is not using the Domain Names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, and it is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The non-use of the Domain Names does not qualify as use of the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is there any evidence of the Respondent having made demonstrable preparations to use the Domain Names.

The term "verification" risks being read as a reference to verification on the Complainant's Facebook platform. Moreover, the terms "support" and "mail" may be interpreted by Internet users as a reference to the Help Center or customer service for the Complainant's Facebook platform. It should be noted that the Complainant owns the domain name <facebookmail.com> and uses it to connect with its users. The use of such terms in the Domain Names is likely to create a false impression that the Domain Names are affiliated with, endorsed by, or operated by the Complainant.

The Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark is highly distinctive and famous throughout the world, thus, the Respondent could not reasonably argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the FACEBOOK trademark at the time of registration of the Domain Names. It is well established that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent the finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

Although the Registrar has confirmed that the Registrant Organization for the Domain Names <noreply-facebookmail.com> and <noreply-security-facebookmail.com> is "Support Meta", the Complainant notes that the publicly available Whois record lists "Meta Support" as the registrant. The Respondent has listed in the Whois record as "Meta Support" in Viet Nam, which is certainly false and merely intended to generate confusion surrounding the identity of the registrant of the Domain Names.

Given the composition of the Domain Names it carries with it a significant risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. There is no apparent use that the Respondent could make of the Domain Names that would not lead to a misleading impression of association with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Respondent's registration of not one but three Domain Names comprising the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark exhibits a pattern of abusive domain name registration targeting the Complainant, which is further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent "Support Meta, Support Meta" sent email communications to the Center on September 8, 2025, and September 9, 2025, respectively, stating "someone hacked my gmail and used the legitimate click to pay for the domain" and "I have had my computer hacked and my information used illegally".

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request. Rather, one of the disputed Domain name registrants claimed that its computer and gmail account had been hacked and its information was illegally used.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- the disputed domain name registrants have similar names as "Meta Support" or "Support Meta".
- the Domain Names were registered with the same Registrar.
- the disputed domain name registrants are all located in Viet Nam, having similiary-composed registrant email addresses, i.e., [name+number]@gmail.com.
- all three Domain Names exhibit a similar naming pattern, i.e., comprising terms relating to technical support ("noreply", "security", "support", "verification") followed by "-facebookmail" under the same generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD).
- none of the Domain Names have been actively used.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of FACEBOOK trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of FACEBOOK trademark is reproduced within the Domain Names. The addition of other terms "noreply", "support", "security", "verification", and "mail" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark. [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). Since the respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions, 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 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 Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The non-use of the Domain Names does not support a finding of legitimate noncommercial or fair use, absent evidence to the contrary.

Furthermore, the Complainant owns the domain name <facebookmail.com>. The Panel finds that the additional terms “support”, “verification”, “noreply”, or “security” in the Domain Names may be interpreted by Internet users as a reference to the various services of the Complainant’s Facebook platform. Therefore, Internet users may mistakenly believe that the Domain Names are associated with the Complaint, contrary to the fact.

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 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.

It is well established that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The following circumstances are relevant in assessing that the Respondent’s registration of the Domain Names is in bad faith: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain names about 18 years after the Complainant register its trademark FACEBOOK; (ii) FACEBOOK is a worldwide famous trademark and the additional terms in the Domain Names can be interpreted as related to the services provided by the Complaint; thus, the Respondent could not reasonably argue that it did not have any knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the FACEBOOK trademark at the time of registration of the Domain Names.

The following circumstances are relevant in assessing that the Respondent’s use of the Domain Names is in bad faith: (i) FACEBOOK is a worldwide famous trademark; (ii) the Respondent did not file a response to the Complaint, and there is no evidence nor allegation that the Respondent makes any use of the Domain Names; (iii) the Respondent has used “Meta Support”, “Meta” or “Support Meta” as its name, which is mostly likely false information and shows the Respondent’s intention to generate confusion surrounding the identity of the registrant of the Domain Names; (iv) the composition of the Domain Names targets the Complainant and carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Therefore, there is no apparent use that the Respondent could make of the Domain Names that would not lead to a misleading impression of association with the Complainant.

Further, the Respondent's registration of three Domain Names comprising the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark exhibits a pattern of abusive domain name registration targeting the Complainant, which is further evidence of bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Names in bad faith. 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 name <noreply-facebookmail.com>, <noreply-security-facebookmail.com>, and <support-verification-facebookmail.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mauricio Jalife Daher/

Mauricio Jalife Daher

Sole Panelist

Date: September 29, 2025.