

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Doan Minh Quoc

Case No. D2025-5104

### 1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Doan Minh Quoc, Viet Nam.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <facebookmarketing.biz> (“disputed domain name No. 1”) and <facebookvietnam.net> (“disputed domain name No. 2”) are registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 8, 2025. On December 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 31, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on January 13, 2026. 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 company organized under the laws of the United States that operates the well-known “Facebook” social networking website and mobile application.

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of numerous trademarks relating to its former company name and brand FACEBOOK, inter alia, but not limited to, the following:

- word trademark FACEBOOK, United States Registration (United States Patent and Trademark Office), registration number: 3,041,791, registration date: January 10, 2006, status: active;
- word trademark FACEBOOK, Vietnamese Intellectual Property Office, registration number: 4-0128158-000 registration date: June 26, 2009, status: active;
- word trademark FACEBOOK, International Registration (World Intellectual Property Office), registration number: 1075807, registration date: July 16, 2010, status: active.

Moreover, Complainant has demonstrated to own and to operate numerous domain names relating to its FACEBOOK trademark, e.g. since 1997 the domain name <facebook.com> used to run Complainant’s Facebook website at “www.facebook.com”.

Respondent, according to the Registrar verification for the disputed domain names, has an address in Viet Nam. The disputed domain name No. 1 was registered on March 20, 2020, while the disputed domain name No. 2 was registered on January 21, 2019. Both disputed domain names resolve to websites apparently set up in the Vietnamese language which frequently refer to Complainant’s FACEBOOK trademark and official logo. According to Complainant’s undisputed contentions, the website under the disputed domain name No. 1 resolves to a blog-style website, introducing e.g. the “Facebook Like68 Increase Service” which is offered under the disputed domain name No. 2, including the sale of “Facebook” “post likes”, “post shares”, “comments”, “followers”, “group members”, and “views” for varying prices. Apparently, none of these websites features any disclaimer or similar wording regarding the lack of relationship between the Parties.

Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent by email on October 24, 2005, and by postal mail on November 7, 2025, which remained unanswered.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to Complainant.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. Notably, Complainant contends that since its launch in 2004, the FACEBOOK trademark rapidly developed considerable renown and goodwill worldwide, including in Viet Nam where the Respondent is based, with today 3.07 billion monthly active users and 2.11 billion daily active users on average worldwide, and currently ranked as the fourth most downloaded mobile application worldwide.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's well-known FACEBOOK trademark, as they both incorporate the latter in its entirety, followed by the terms "marketing" and "vietnam", respectively. Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since (1) Respondent is not a licensee of Complainant, is not affiliated with the latter in any way, and has not been granted any authorization by Complainant to make use of the FACEBOOK trademark in a domain name or otherwise, (2) Respondent's use of the disputed domain name No. 1 has the effect of conferring reputational advantage on the website under the disputed domain name No. 2 by promoting the services featured on this website, from which Respondent, in turn, appears to be receiving commercial gain, (3) Respondent's use of the disputed domain name No. 2 offering for sale Facebook "post likes", "post shares", "comments", "followers", "group members", and "views" for varying prices does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, either, (4) moreover, such purchase also breaches Complainant's "Meta Developer Policies" as it goes beyond the limits placed on the functionality of the "Facebook" platform, and (5) although the blog-style website under the disputed domain name No. 1 does not directly sell services, it is clear that Respondent is using the latter merely as a vehicle to redirect Internet users to the website under the disputed domain name No. 2 which clearly monetizes FACEBOOK-related engagement. Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since (1) Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark is highly distinctive and famous throughout the world, (2) Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the intent to derive commercial gain from the promotion and sale of "Facebook" "post likes", "post shares", "comments", "followers", "group members", and "views", (3) Respondent is using the disputed domain names to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by exploiting the goodwill and reputation attached to Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark and creating a likelihood of confusion with the latter, (4) the offering for sale of such services is in violation of Complainant's "Meta Developer Policies" and facilitates breach of the "Facebook" Community Standards, and (5) the absence of a disclaimer on the websites under the disputed domain names to clarify Respondent's relationship (or lack thereof) with Complainant further adds to the confusion caused by the disputed domain names themselves and constitutes additional evidence of Respondent's intentional bad faith conduct,

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in 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.

Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

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

First, 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 Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark and the disputed domain names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its FACEBOOK trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Also, the entirety of such trademark is reproduced within both disputed domain names, simply added by the descriptive term "marketing" and the geographical term "vietnam", respectively. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, the descriptive term "marketing" and the geographical term "vietnam") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, holds the first element of the Policy has been established.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Second, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain names and Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with e.g. the term "facebook" on its own. To the contrary, both disputed domain names resolve to websites apparently set up in the Vietnamese language which frequently refer to Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark and official logo, without any authorization to do so, whereby the disputed domain name No. 1 resolves to a blog-style website, introducing e.g. the "Facebook Like68 Increase Service" which is offered under the disputed domain name No. 2, including the sale of "Facebook" "post likes", "post shares", "comments", "followers", "group members" and "views" for varying prices, without any authorization to do so; apparently, none of these websites features any disclaimer or similar wording regarding the lack of relationship between the Parties. Such making use of the disputed domain names neither qualifies as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of the Policy. Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain names, incorporating Complainant's well-known and distinctive FACEBOOK trademark with descriptive or geographical terms, carries a risk of implied affiliation with Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel, therefore, finds the second element of the Policy has been established, too.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Third, 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.

The circumstances in this case leave no doubt that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant's worldwide renowned "Facebook" platform and Complainant's rights in the FACEBOOK trademark when registering the disputed domain names and that the latter clearly are directed thereto. Moreover, using the disputed domain names to run economically connected websites, both set up in the Vietnamese language, which frequently refer to Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark and official logo, without any authorization to do so, and absent any disclaimer or similar wording regarding the lack of relationship between the Parties, is a clear indication that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's websites. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Moreover, the fact that Respondent created and registered the disputed domain names both of which include Complainant's well-known FACEBOOK trademark also fulfills the requirements of a pattern of bad faith conduct within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

The Panel, therefore, holds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

### **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, <facebookmarketing.biz> and <facebookvietnam.net>, be transferred to Complainant.

*/Stephanie G. Hartung/*

**Stephanie G. Hartung**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 26, 2026