

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Vladyslav Naumov  
Case No. D2025-3185

### **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 Vladyslav Naumov, Ukraine.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <comprarfansfacebook.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 8, 2025. On August 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 (Domain Administrator) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 12, 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 August 20, 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 August 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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 United States-based social technology company and a leading provider of online social networking services. The Complainant operates, inter alia, several social media platforms under the trademarks FACEBOOK, INSTAGRAM, META QUEST (formerly OCULUS), and WHATSAPP.

Founded in 2004, the Facebook platform is accessible online via its primary website, “www.facebook.com”, as well as through a mobile application (the “App”), both of which are available worldwide in more than 70 languages. The Facebook website (“www.facebook.com”) and the App rank among the most visited websites and most frequently downloaded applications globally. As of December 31, 2023, the Facebook platform had approximately 3.07 billion monthly active users and 2.11 billion average daily active users worldwide.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations for its FACEBOOK brand in numerous jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 4,339,123, FACEBOOK, word mark, registered on May 21, 2013, in Class 42;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 005585518, FACEBOOK, word mark, registered on May 25, 2011, in Classes 35, 41, 42, and 45; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 5,189,225 for the figurative, registered on April 25, 2017, in Classes 38, 41, 42, and 45, with the following graphic representation:



- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 014997878 for the figurative, registered on April 20, 2020, in Classes 9, 16, 18, 20, 21, 25, 35, 38, 41, 42, 43, and 45, with the following graphic representation:



(hereinafter collectively referred to as the “FACEBOOK mark” and the “Thumb-up mark”, respectively).

Prior decisions under the Policy have recognized the worldwide renowned and famous character of the FACEBOOK mark. <sup>1</sup>

The Complainant further owns various domain names comprising its FACEBOOK mark, including <facebook.com> (registered on March 29, 1997), which resolves to its social media platform.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 11, 2024, and resolves to a Spanish-language website that purports to offer packages of Facebook “fans” for varying prices. The website further provides instructions on how to purchase likes, followers, or fans for the Instagram platform, as well as for other social media platforms, including TikTok and Twitch. The website displays the heading “comprarfansfacebook.com Fans y Likes para Facebook,” which translates as “buyfansfacebook.com Fans and Likes for Facebook,” and allegedly offers various packages of “fans,” including EUR 39.90 for 500 fans, EUR 69.90 for 1,000 fans, and EUR 149.90 for 5,000 fans. The website also claims to enable increasing the value of a “FanPage” by purchasing Facebook fans. It prominently displays a large, modified Thumb-up image resembling the Complainant’s registered figurative trademarks, including as a favicon, and employs a blue-and-white color scheme similar to that used in the Complainant’s figurative marks and on the Facebook platform. Several

---

<sup>1</sup>See, e.g., *Facebook Inc. v. te5gfh gtfghbhf*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2433](#), (“the Complainant’s trademark FACEBOOK enjoys worldwide renown”); *Facebook, Inc. v. Naresh Bali*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-2510](#). (“Given the fame and worldwide recognition of the Complainant’s FACEBOOK trademark”); or *Facebook Inc. v. te5gfh gtfghbhf*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2433](#), (“the Complainant’s trademark FACEBOOK enjoys worldwide renown, i.e., it is an internationally famous trademark”).

testimonials in Spanish, from individuals with Spanish names, are displayed, along with a link to a local news publication in Huelva, Spain, regarding the most followed Instagram account (“<https://huelvabuenasnoticias.com/2023/09/24/cual-es-la-cuenta-mas-seguida-de-instagram/>”). The website provides no information regarding its owner or the owner of the disputed domain name, nor does it include any statement clarifying the absence of affiliation with the Complainant or its trademarks. The copyright notice reads: “© comprarfansfacebook.com | Fans y Likes para Facebook. Reservados todos los derechos.”

On June 24, 2025, the Complainant submitted a notice of trademark infringement through the Registrar’s registrant contact form. The Respondent did not respond.

## **5. Parties’ Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant asserts that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

Specifically, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name incorporates the FACEBOOK mark and is therefore confusingly similar thereto. The addition of the terms “comprar” (“buy”) and “fans” does not preclude a finding of confusing similarity, as the FACEBOOK mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the generic top-level domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is a standard registration requirement and may be disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no authorization to use its trademarks, and there is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor is it using the domain in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The *Oki Data* criteria (as set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)) are not satisfied in this case. Specifically, (i) the website associated with the disputed domain name purports to offer for sale packages of fans on the Complainant’s social media platforms, which interferes with the proper functioning of these platforms and constitutes inauthentic behavior by artificially inflating content popularity, in violation of the Meta Developer Policies and the Facebook Community Standards; (ii) the website contains numerous references to the Facebook platform, as well as depictions similar to the Complainant’s iconic figurative marks, and employs a blue-and-white color scheme resembling that of the Facebook platform, thereby suggesting a false affiliation; and (iii) the website does not feature any disclaimer clarifying the Respondent’s lack of relationship with the Complainant. Prior UDRP panels have held that using a domain name to sell likes, followers, or shares constitutes an unauthorized and potentially prejudicial activity toward the social media platform owner and Internet users, and does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The highly distinctive and famous character of the FACEBOOK mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the content of the Respondent’s website demonstrate prior knowledge of, and intent to target the Complainant, its trademarks, and its social media platforms. The Respondent’s use of a proxy service to conceal its identity, combined with the failure to respond to the cease-and-desist notice, constitutes further evidence of bad faith. The use of the disputed domain name and the content of the Respondent’s website further corroborate this targeting. The Respondent has sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademarks. The absence of a disclaimer clarifying the Respondent’s lack of affiliation with the Complainant further contributes to the confusion and constitutes additional evidence of bad faith; even if a clear and prominent disclaimer were included, it would not suffice to remedy the Respondent’s illegitimate use of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Complainant has made the relevant assertions required under the Policy, and the dispute properly falls within its scope. The Panel has the authority to decide the dispute by examining the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexed materials, and allegations, and may conduct limited independent research pursuant to the general powers of the Panel, as articulated, *inter alia*, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

### **6.1 Preliminary Matters**

The Panel notes that no communication has been received from the Respondent.

The Respondent's postal address is listed in Ukraine, which, at the date of this Decision, is subject to an international conflict that could affect case notifications. In accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel has considered whether the proceedings should continue (see *Wilshire Refrigeration & Appliance, Inc. v. Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henrystlist.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0962](#)). Having reviewed all circumstances, the Panel concludes that the proceedings should continue. The Panel notes that the Center used both the Registrar contact form and the Respondent's email address, as registered with the Registrar to notify the Complaint. There is no evidence that the notification emails were not successfully delivered.

Furthermore, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 11, 2024, more than two years after the onset of the international conflict, and thus appears capable of controlling both the disputed domain name and its content. Having apparently received notification of the Complaint by email, the Respondent would have been able to prepare and submit a Response if it had wished to do so. The Panel also notes that the website hosted at the disputed domain name is in Spanish and displays several testimonials from individuals with Spanish names, as well as a link to an article from a local news publication in Huelva, Spain ([huelvabuenasnoticias.com](#)), suggesting its location and/or operation in Spain. This may support the inference that the Respondent is not actually located in Ukraine and is capable of controlling the site and receiving all email communications related to the disputed domain name.

Moreover, for the reasons analyzed later in this Decision, the Panel considers—despite the absence of a Response - that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith, intending to unfairly target the Complainant's goodwill in its trademarks.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that it may proceed to decide this case and draw inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit any Response. While the Respondent's failure to submit a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3; see also *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1909](#).

### **6.2 Substantive Matters**

#### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well established that the first element primarily serves as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity entails a reasoned yet relatively straightforward but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, namely the FACEBOOK mark and the Thumb-up mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entire FACEBOOK mark is reproduced and remains recognizable 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—the Spanish term “comprar” (“buy”) and the term “fans”—may be relevant to the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such additions do not preclude 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.

Further, the relevant Top-Level-Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name is considered a standard registration requirement and is therefore disregarded for the purposes of the first element of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

Accordingly, 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 non-exhaustive 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 rests with the complainant, panels have recognized that establishing 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. Consequently, 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 that 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 notes that the Respondent’s name, as provided in the Registrar verification, does not resemble the terms included in the disputed domain name containing the FACEBOOK mark, and there is no evidence on record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, a search of WIPO’s Global Brand Database confirms that the Respondent holds no trademark registrations for any of these terms.<sup>2</sup>

The Panel further observes that the website associated with the disputed domain name purports to offer for sale likes or followers for the Facebook platform and provides information on how to acquire fans, likes, or followers for Instagram as well as for other third-party platforms, including TikTok and Twitch. The site provides no information regarding its owner or the owner of the disputed domain name and contains various references to the Complainant’s trademarks. According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the site prominently displays, alongside references to the FACEBOOK mark, a large depiction similar to the Thumb-up mark, including as a favicon, and uses a blue-and-white color scheme similar to that employed in

---

<sup>2</sup>Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

the Complainant's figurative marks and on the Facebook platform. Under these circumstances, the Respondent's website cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy, as it intentionally creates confusion or association with the Complainant, its trademarks, and social media platform, and leverages the reputation of the FACEBOOK mark to drive traffic to the Respondent's website. To the extent that the Respondent may be considered as a service provider of the type addressed in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8, the Panel considers that virtually none of the so-called Oki Data criteria (set forth in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, *supra*) for a bona fide offering of goods or services using a domain name containing a third-party trademark as a reseller, distributor, or service provider are satisfied (arguably only the first criterion). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the sale of fake likes or followers for social media platforms—mostly generated automatically or artificially through technical means or via fake accounts—although common, is not entirely legitimate, as it may be misleading. Such artificially generated popularity may mislead users, creating an unfounded sense of confidence that could adversely affect their decision-making, including economic or commercial decisions. As correctly noted by the Complainant, prior decisions under the Policy have addressed this issue, concluding that such activities are likely or potentially prejudicial both to Internet users and to social media platform owners, and therefore may not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. See, e.g., *Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Dave Anothu, Influenceurs LTD*, *supra*; *Instagram, LLC v. 赵坤 (Zhao Kun)*, *supra*; or *Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Whols Protected*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4370](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case, and 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy enumerates non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith; other circumstances may likewise be relevant in assessing whether a Respondent's registration and use of a domain name constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademarks are highly distinctive and globally renowned. The Panel further finds that both the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the FACEBOOK mark, and the content of the Respondent's website, which intentionally generates confusion and targets the Complainant and its trademarks for commercial gain, together with all other circumstances of this case, indicate the registration and use in bad faith of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's dubious activities on the website - purportedly selling unauthorized and artificially generated likes or followers for social media platforms - as well as the apparent impersonation or passing off of the Complainant through the use of a similar enlarged version of the Complainant's figurative mark, including as a favicon, references to its famous FACEBOOK mark, and the adoption of a blue-and-white color scheme similar to that employed in the Complainant's figurative marks and on the Facebook platform, corroborate the Respondent's bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, taking into account all cumulative circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered with the intent to target the Complainant's famous trademark, seeking to create a false affiliation with the FACEBOOK mark to drive traffic for commercial gain.

Accordingly, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy. The Complainant has therefore 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 <comprarfansfacebook.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Reyes Campello Estebarez/*

**Reyes Campello Estebarez**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2025