

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. libin
Case No. D2025-3813

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is libin, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <metasuperintelligencelab.com> and <metasuperintelligencelabs.org> (the "Disputed Domain Names") are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 18, 2025. On September 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelab.com>. On September 22, 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 (Redacted For Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 22, 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 on October 2, 2025, requesting the addition of the Disputed Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelabs.org>.

On October 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the additional Disputed Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelabs.org>. On October 3, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the additional domain name which corresponded with the named Respondent and contact information in the amended Complaint for the Disputed Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelab.com>.

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 October 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 26, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on November 3, 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, and operates, inter alia, Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus), and WhatsApp.

Complainant’s claimed focus is to bring the metaverse to life and to help people connect, find communities, and grow businesses. The metaverse will feel like a hybrid of today’s online social experiences, sometimes expanded into three dimensions or projected into the physical world. It will let users share immersive experiences with other people even when they cannot be together – and do things together they could not do in the physical world.

Founded in 2004, Complainant’s Facebook platform is one of the leading providers of online social-media and social-networking services. Facebook’s mission is to give people the power to build community and bring the world closer together. People use Facebook’s services to stay connected with friends and family, to discover what is going on in the world, and to share and express what matters to them.

Access to Facebook was originally restricted to students at Harvard University, but quickly expanded to other universities and, in 2006, to anyone in the world with a valid email address. Since its launch in 2004, Facebook rapidly developed considerable renown and goodwill worldwide, with 1 million active users by the end of 2004, 100 million users in August 2008, 500 million users in July 2010, and 1 billion users worldwide by September 2012. Facebook had 2.27 billion monthly active users by September 2018, and 2.80 billion by December 2020.

Today, Facebook has approximately 3.07 billion monthly active users and 2.11 billion daily active users on average worldwide (as of May 8, 2025). Facebook is also available for mobile devices 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.

In June 2025, Complainant launched a new artificial intelligence (AI) superintelligence project called Meta Superintelligence Labs, also known as MSI. The project is intended to consolidate Complainant’s core AI teams under one roof and to develop personal superintelligence for everyone. Complainant’s creation of Meta Superintelligence Labs was reported as early as June 10, 2025, by the New York Times and in an article titled “Meta is Creating a New A.I. Lab to Pursue Superintelligence.” Complainant issued an internal memorandum on June 30, 2025, announcing the new MSI initiative and the team that would lead it. On June 30, 2025, Complainant also published a public letter titled “Personal Superintelligence” that explained Meta’s superintelligence vision.

Given the exclusive online nature of Complainant's social-networking business, Complainant's domain names consisting of its various trademarks are not only the heart of its entire business, but also the main way for millions of users to avail themselves of its services. Reflecting its global reach, Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names consisting of or including the META trademark (the "META Mark"), registered under various generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") as well as under a number of country-code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs").

Complainant has also made substantial investments to develop a strong presence online by being active on various social-media platforms. For instance, Complainant's official page on Facebook has over 91 million "likes." In addition, Complainant has 13.5 million followers on X (formerly Twitter).

Complainant has secured registrations its META Mark in a number of jurisdictions, including but not limited to the following:

Andorran Trademark Registration No. 43626 for META, registered on January 3, 2022, in classes 9, 28, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45;

Monaco Trademark Registration No. 22.00039 for META, registered on February 8, 2022, in classes 9, 28, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45; and

European Union Trade Mark No. 018686894 for META, registered on July 14, 2023, in classes 10, 14, 16, 18, 21, and 25.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on July 1, 2025, and resolve to Registrar parking pages offering the Disputed Domain Names for sale for the following "Buy Now" prices: EUR 23,456 for <metasuperintelligentlab.com> and EUR 25,678 for <metasuperintelligentlabs.org>.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the META Mark because they include the entirety of the META Mark, together with the term "superintelligent" and the terms "lab" or "labs" under the gTLDs ".com" and ".org". Complainant further contends that the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainant submits that Respondent is not using the Disputed Domain Name for any bona fide offering of goods or services. Complainant further submits that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized Respondent to use the META Mark.

Complainant further submits that Respondent has only offered the Disputed Domain Names for sale. Complainant further submits that, under the circumstances, this is not a legitimate or fair use. Complainant further submits that both of the parking pages feature the same email address. This email address has been listed under the registrant's contact details for Respondents in several UDRP cases in which the panels have ordered transfer of those disputed domain name(s) to Complainant. It appears that the same party is behind several UDRP cases, having been ordered to transfer those disputed domain names at issue in those cases.

Complainant further submits that, on July 24, 2025, its lawyers, in an attempt to resolve the matter amicably, submitted a notice to Respondent via the registrant's contact details provided by the Registrar in relation to the Disputed Domain Name <metasuperinteligencelab.com>. Complainant's lawyers have not yet receive a reply.

Complainant further submits that Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names by Respondent constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant's assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Names registered by Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to the META Mark which Complainant has rights; and
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration of the META Mark is prima facie evidence of Complainant having enforceable rights in the META Mark.

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

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 META Mark and the Disputed Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the META Mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the META Mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of other terms, here "superintelligence" and "lab" or "labs," 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 Names and the META Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [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 three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Names:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the META Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. Rather, Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering trademark abusive domain names and offering them for sale, which does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests.

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 the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Names' registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the META Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Names; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names in order to prevent the owner of the META Mark from reflecting the META Mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the Disputed Domain Names, you [Respondent] 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 META Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

The Panel finds that the actions of Respondent meet the criteria of paragraph 4(b)(i) and (ii) of the Policy and are therefore deemed to be in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names were in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Complainant has provided ample evidence to show the widespread use of the META Mark prior to Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Names. Therefore, Respondent likely knew, or should have known, of the META Mark when registering the Disputed Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Furthermore, Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering and offering for sale domain names targeting Complainant's META Mark, as found in prior UDRP proceedings against Respondent, which is further evidence of bad faith use and registration of the Disputed Domain Names under the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(ii). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, (including a blank or "for sale" page), would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the META Mark, and the composition of the Disputed Domain Names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Names <metasuperintelligencelab.com> and <metasuperintelligence labs.org> be transferred to Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: November 7, 2025