

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Md Shahzad Hassan, mshassan
Case No. D2026-0212

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 Md Shahzad Hassan, mshassan, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <fbvideodownloader.onl> and <snapface.onl> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 19, 2026. On January 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 21, 2026, 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 January 26, 2026.

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 January 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 18, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on January 21, 2026, and February 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on February 27, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers, or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a formal response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreements, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Meta Platforms, Inc. (formerly Facebook, Inc.), a United States company operating, inter alia, the social networks Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus), and WhatsApp, and owning several trademark registrations for FACEBOOK, FACE and FB, among which the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3,041,791 for FACEBOOK, registered on January 10, 2006;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1075807 for FACEBOOK, registered on July 16, 2010;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 005585518 for FACEBOOK, registered on May 25, 2011;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 018075698 for FACE, registered on May 22, 2020;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 018146501 for FB, registered on November 7, 2020;
- Australian Trademark No. 2048592 for FB, registered on August 10, 2022.

The Complainant operates on the Internet at the main website "www.facebook.com", as well as with many other generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs") consisting of or including the trademark FACEBOOK.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <fbvideodownloader.onl> on February 5, 2025, and <snapface.onl> on April 28, 2025. The disputed domain name <snapface.onl> resolves to a website titled "Facebook Video Downloader – Save FB Videos in HD / SnapFace", reproducing the Complainant's trademarks, logo, and colors and purportedly offering a free tool to download video content (photos, reels and stories) from the Complainant's Facebook platform, while the disputed domain name <fbvideodownloader.onl>, when the Complaint was filed, redirected to the Respondent's website at "https://snapface.onl", and currently resolves to a webpage of the website "www.dreamhost.com" as a parked domain name.

On 10 November 2025, the Complainant's lawyers submitted Registrar registrant contact form notices and sent a cease-and-desist letter, without receiving any reply.

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 disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its trademarks FACE and FB.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain names or to use the trademarks within the disputed domain names, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain name <snapface.onl> resolves to a website titled "Facebook Video Downloader – Save FB Videos in HD / SnapFace", reproducing the Complainant's trademarks, logo, and colors and purportedly offering a free tool to download video content (photos, reels and stories) from the Complainant's Facebook platform, while the disputed domain name <fbvideodownloader.onl> redirects to the Respondent's website at "https://snapface.onl".

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademarks FACEBOOK, FACE and FB are distinctive and internationally known. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain names to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no formal response to the Complainant's contentions. However, as noted above, on January 21, 2026, and February 2, 2026, the Respondent sent the following informal email communications to the Center:

"Thank you for your email regarding Case No. D2026-0212 and the registrar-disclosed registrant information. We confirm that we will comply in relation to <fbvideodownloader.onl>. We will not renew this domain registration, and it will be allowed to expire and be deleted automatically in February 2026 as per the registrar's expiration and deletion process. Please let us know if you require any further information from our side" (January 21, 2026);

"I write as the Respondent, Md Shahzad Hassan, further to the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceeding dated January 29, 2026. In accordance with the UDRP Rules, this communication is copied to the Complainant's counsel. 1. Procedural posture The Respondent will file a complete Response within the applicable deadline and reserves the right to submit supporting exhibits (including contemporaneous screenshots and technical records). For avoidance of doubt, the Respondent has not attempted to transfer, conceal, or change ownership of either disputed domain name and will continue to comply with Registrar Lock. 2. Respondent's position – clear separation between the two domain names The Complaint seeks to treat two distinct domain names as a single narrative. The Respondent's position is as follows: (A) <fbvideodownloader.onl> (without prejudice) Without any admission of liability, and strictly without prejudice, the Respondent does not intend to continue operating and has ceased any redirection configuration previously associated with it. The Respondent is prepared to cooperate with an orderly disposition of that domain name as may be directed by the Panel/Registrar, subject always to proper procedure. (B) <snapface.onl> (fully contested – dismissal requested) The Respondent contests the Complaint as it relates to and requests that the Panel deny the remedy sought for this domain name. 3. Core points (summary) The Complainant bears the burden of proving each element under Policy paragraph 4(a).

The Respondent will address each element fully in the formal Response. By way of summary: (i) No confusing similarity in the manner alleged does not contain 'Facebook'. 'snapface' is a distinct composite of dictionary terms. The Complainant cannot claim exclusive rights over ordinary words such as 'snap' or 'face', nor over all combinations that might loosely evoke a general concept. (ii) Rights and legitimate interests has been operated under an independent brand name. Any limited reference to 'Facebook' (if any) is purely nominative/descriptive to identify a third-party platform in connection with user-supplied public URLs, and not to suggest sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. (iii) No bad faith registration or use The Respondent did not register to sell it to the Complainant, to block the Complainant, to disrupt a competitor, or to attract users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Where any presentation element could be misconstrued, remedial steps have been taken to avoid confusion, including strengthening nonaffiliation notices and ensuring distinct branding. To the extent the Complaint relies on allegations framed as 'copyright', the Respondent notes that the UDRP is directed to abusive domain name registration targeting trademarks; any such allegations will be addressed in the formal Response in their proper context. 4. Exhibits The Respondent will provide exhibits with the formal Response, including: • Current screenshots of demonstrating independent branding and prominent non-affiliation notice; • Technical confirmation that any forwarding/redirection from is disabled; and • A short timeline of corrective steps taken to avoid confusion. Please confirm receipt of this communication. Sincerely, Md Shahzad Hassan" (February 2, 2026).

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

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

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 trademarks and the disputed domain names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Complainant's trademarks FACE and FB are reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here "videodownloader" and "snap", 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 Complainant's trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well-accepted that a generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".onl", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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 names. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the present record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed 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 disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. As regards the disputed domain name <snapface.onl>, the Respondent asserts that the Complainant cannot claim exclusive rights over ordinary words such as “snap” or “face”, nor over all combinations that might loosely evoke a general concept, operated under an independent brand name, while any limited reference to “Facebook” (if any) is purely nominative/descriptive to identify a third-party platform. The Panel finds that merely registering a domain name comprised of two dictionary words would not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent, especially if the corresponding website is aimed at goods or services that target a third-party trademark, like in the present case, trading off the Complainant’s trademarks, an aspect that will be considered in more details under the third element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.1.

Moreover, the Panel considers the Respondent’s statement at the bottom of the homepage “‘snapface.onl’ is NOT affiliated with Facebook or Meta” is insufficient to clarify the Respondent’s relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant, noting also circumstances including the registration and redirect use of the disputed domain name <fbvideodownloader.onl> (incorporating the Complainant’s FB mark) and the content on the Respondent’s website. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.

Based on the available record, 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 a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks FACEBOOK, FACE, and FB in the social networks field is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, especially because in the website at the disputed domain names the Respondent is reproducing the Complainant’s trademarks, logo, and colors, purportedly providing a tool to download video content from the Complainant’s Facebook platform.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names are also being used in bad faith since on the website at the disputed domain names the Respondent is purportedly providing a tool for downloading video content from the Complainant's Facebook platform, placing the privacy and security of users of such platform at risk, while displaying the Complainant's trademarks, logo, and colors. Therefore, despite the Respondent's assertion to the contrary, the Panel finds that under the circumstances of this case the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the disputed domain name's source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the existence of a disclaimer not being clear and sufficiently prominent on the Respondent's website, regarding the Respondent's relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant, adds to the confusion caused by the disputed domain names and constitutes additional evidence of the Respondent's bad faith conduct, as it could be considered an admission by the Respondent that users may be confused. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.7.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent more likely than not intentionally registered and was using the disputed domain names in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, and to attract Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain name <fbvideodownloader.onl>, resolving to a webpage of the website "www.dreamhost.com" as a parked domain name, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks in the social networks field, the nature of the disputed domain name (wholly incorporating the Complainant's trademark FB, with the mere addition of the term "videodownloader"), and the prior use of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain names, which incorporate the Complainant's trademarks FACE and FB in their entirety with the addition of the terms "videodownloader" and "snap", both referring to the Complainant's field of activity, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. Moreover, the Panel finds it relevant that the Respondent registered both disputed domain names, and that despite the additional terms being different the Complainant's marks are both incorporated and the use of the disputed domain names were previously coordinated, thus suggesting a pattern of activity seeking to take advantage of the Complainant and its marks.

Based on the available record, 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 names <fbvideodownloader.onl> and <snapface.onl> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: March 5, 2026