

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Web Squad LLC

Case No. D2025-3316

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Web Squad LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names (the “Domain Names”) were registered with the respective registrars on the corresponding dates of registration, as follows:

Domain Name	Registrar	Date of registration	Also referred to hereinafter as
<metacomdevice.com>	PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com	December 10, 2024	Domain Name 1
<metacomdevices.com>	Hostinger Operations, UAB	February 25, 2025	Domain Name 2
<wwwmetacomdevice.com>	Hostinger Operations, UAB	May 3, 2025	Domain Name 3

The Registrars above will collectively be referred to as the “Registrars”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 18, 2025. On August 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name <metacomdevice.com>. On August 20, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 21, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint, adding the Domain Names <metacomdevices.com> and <wwwmetacomdevice.com> to the

Complaint on September 2, 2025. On September 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the additional Domain Names. On September 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 10, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 2, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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

Complainant is a United States social technology company which operates Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus), and WhatsApp. Complainant’s related company, Meta Platforms Technologies, provides virtual reality (VR) and mixed reality (MR) products under the Meta Quest name. Meta currently markets and offers its VR products (including the “Meta Quest” headsets) via its official website at “<https://www.meta.com/gb/en/quest>” and prompts Internet users to create a Meta account for purpose of their Meta device at “<https://meta.com/device>”. As at March 19, 2025, over USD 2 billion has been spent on Meta Quest titles to-date.

Complainant owns several registered trademarks in various jurisdictions, including:

- Andorran registered trademark number 43626 for the META word mark, registered on January 3, 2022;
- Monaco registered trademark number 2200039 for the META word mark, registered on February 8, 2022;
- European Union registered trademark number 018686894, for the META word mark, registered on July 14, 2023; and
- European Union registered trademark number 018650026 for the  Meta design mark, registered on December 20, 2022.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, Domain Name 1 resolved to a website that allegedly offered a guide on how to “activate Quest 2/3 Pro... using the Meta Quest app”. This website featured Complainant’s META design mark, along with an “ACTIVATE NOW” button.

At the time of filing of the Amended Complaint, Domain Names 2 and 3 resolved to websites featuring the title “Meta” and Complainant’s META design mark buttons, with “ACTIVATE NOW” banners, as well as a guide to pair a “Meta” device. The “ACTIVATE NOW” button further redirects Internet users to another web page, which prompted Internet users to “Enter the code shown on your device” to “Connect your device”. After having clicked on the “connect” button, Internet users are further redirected to a web page that informed Internet users in large red letters that “Activation failed” and “Sorry, your code has failed to activate”, prompting them to “Contact the Support team to fix this issue immediately” and providing a United States phone number.

On April 4, 2025, in an attempt to resolve this matter amicably, Complainant's lawyers sent a cease and desist letter with regards to Domain Name 1, to Respondent via email and submitted a Registrar registrant contact form notice. Complainant's lawyers did not receive any response.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Names.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations for META, and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known META products and services.

Further, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Names, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") states that failure to respond to the complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Complainant have provided evidence of their rights in the META trademarks, as noted above under Section 4. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the META trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the META trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Names, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which it is registered (in this case, ".com"), are identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. D2010-0842.

Here, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's META trademarks. The META trademark is reproduced and recognizable in the Domain Names.

Domain Name reference	Domain Name	Additional terms added to Complainant's trademark
1	<metacomdevice.com>	"com" and "device"
2	<metacomdevices.com>	"com" and "devices"
3	<wwwmetacomdevice.com>	"www", "com", and "device"

In particular, the Domain Names' inclusion of Complainant's META trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the respective terms noted above to the META mark, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the META trademarks. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes out such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and their META trademarks, and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. In addition, Complainant assert that Respondent is not authorized to promote Complainant's goods or services and is not related to Complainant. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the META trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Names.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names each resolved to websites that duplicate Complainant's Meta design mark and impersonate Complainant by offering to help and prompting Internet users to activate their Meta devices, which potentially mislead Internet users into thinking that the associated website has been authorized or is operated by or affiliated with Complainant.

Thus, such use by Respondent does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot under the circumstances confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Moreover, the nature of each of the Domain Names, which includes Complainant's trademark META in its entirety, with the addition of the respective terms noted in the table above, is inherently misleading and carries a risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names, and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a domain name registrant, namely:

"(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location."

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the META trademarks long predate the registration of the Domain Names. Complainant is also well known and established. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's META trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized. Therefore, the Panel is of the view that Respondent was aware of the META trademarks when they registered the Domain Names. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2; see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Further, the registration of the Domain Names, each of which includes Complainant's META trademarks suggests Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant's rights in the META trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Names and their effort to opportunistically capitalize on the registration and use of the Domain Names.

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using Domain Names to confuse and mislead consumers looking for bona fide and well-known META products and services of Complainant. In particular, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names each resolved to a website featuring Complainant's META marks, and content that impersonate Complainant by offering to help and prompt Internet users to activate their Meta devices, which would potentially mislead Internet users into thinking that the associated website has been authorized or operated by or affiliated with Complainant, and to divert users to Respondent, as noted above. Respondent has, through the use of such diversionary and fraudulent schemes, intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's META marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's

website. UDRP panels have consistently held that Respondent's use of Domain Names to trade off goodwill in Complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate Complainant constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4158](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith and Complainant has succeeded under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Names <metacomdevice.com>, <metacomdevices.com>, and <wwwmetacomdevice.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: November 5, 2025