

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. 鎧屹 巫, WU KAIYI
Case No. D2026-1126

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 鎧屹 巫, WU KAIYI, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <metaai360.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 16, 2026. On March 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 17, 2026, 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 (Registration Private Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 18, 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 March 23, 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 March 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on April 24, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant Meta Platforms, Inc. (formerly Facebook, Inc.) is a United States social technology company, and operates, inter alia, Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus) and WhatsApp. According to the Complainant, its focus is to bring the metaverse to life and to help people connect, find communities and grow businesses.

In September 2023, the Complainant launched an in-app feature for its apps including WhatsApp, Instagram, Facebook and Messenger called “Meta AI”, a generative AI chatbot powered by technology from LLAMA 2 and a large language model (LLM). The Meta AI assistant is built within Meta’s apps such as WhatsApp and enables users to edit images, generate stickers, and chat with a chatbot.

The Complainant owns many trademark registrations for META, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 7615673 for META (word), registered on December 17, 2024, in international class 9;
- Monaco Trademark Registration No. 22.00039 for META (word), registered on February 8, 2022, in international classes 9, 28, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018686894 for META (word), registered on July 14, 2023, in international classes 10, 14, 16, 18, 21 and 25;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 018650026,  figurative, registered on December 20, 2022, in international classes 9, 28, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42 and 45; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7559777, figurative, registered on November 5, 2024, in international class 42.

The Complainant has registered various domain names that include META, including <meta.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 14, 2025, and does not currently resolve to an active website. According to evidence furnished with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website which stated on the home page: “MetaAI Lab Pioneering Innovation with Metaverse and AI”, and offered an “iChat” function, an “AI-powered digital human chat platform providing customizable interactive learning experiences for students of all ages.” The website also featured a modified version of the Complainant’s logo and figurative trademark. Furthermore, accessing the disputed domain name via a web browser triggered a question of whether the Internet user would like to “Translate page from Chinese (Traditional)”. The Respondent’s website did not feature any disclaimer-like wording as to the lack of relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. Further, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that some text and graphic elements displayed on the website were copied from unrelated third-party sites. On or about May 11, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a page in Chinese, displaying “META AI” against a background of computer-related imagery and inviting users to sign up for updates.

On February 17, 2026, the Complainant’s lawyers sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, 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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it owns trademark registrations for META in various jurisdictions and that the disputed domain name comprises the Complainant's META trademark as its leading element, followed by the letters "ai" and the number "360", registered under the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The Complainant submits that the presence of its META trademark in the disputed domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark, and that the addition of the letters "ai" and number "360" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's META trademark, which remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its META trademark, in a domain name or otherwise. Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a web page entitled "MetaAI" and offers to try its "iChat" service, similar to the "Meta AI" assistant offered by the Complainant via several applications. In addition, the Respondent uses the Complainant's META trademark in the disputed domain name together with the letters "ai" and the Respondent's website also features a graphic which is highly similar to the Complainant's META logo and figurative trademark with the wording "MetaAI" featured under the graphic. By using the disputed domain name in this way, the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its trademark to offer a competing version of a service provided by the Complainant, notably its "Meta AI" assistant. In addition, the Respondent's website, which features a modified version of the Complainant's figurative trademark and uses a similar blue and white colour scheme to that employed by the Complainant, risks misleading Internet users into believing that the Respondent's website is operated by the Complainant. Lastly, the Complainant argues that the circumstances in paragraph 4(c)(ii) and (iii) of the Policy are not applicable in the case at hand, as, essentially, with respect to the first mentioned circumstance there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and with respect to the second mentioned circumstance given the use described above, it is very likely that the Respondent ultimately derives commercial gain from its use of the Complainant's META trademark in the disputed domain name.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant argues that since the re-naming of the Complainant's company as "Meta Platforms, Inc.", the Complainant's META trademark has become well known throughout the world and closely associated with the Complainant's goods and services, the Complainant's re-naming having attracted significant international media attention, while the Complainant's services are used by billions of monthly active users across the globe. Both the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the Respondent's website demonstrate actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. As regards the use, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract users to its website, which purports to offer a similar service to that already being provided by the Complainant under the "Meta AI" feature. The Respondent's website makes explicit reference to the Complainant's META logo and figurative trademark, therefore, the overall impression of the Respondent's website suggests that it is endorsed by or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant therefore submits that Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the Respondent's website is somehow affiliated with or otherwise endorsed by the Complainant, when it is not, and therefore, such behavior of the Respondent indicates bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Furthermore, the Complainant notes that the Respondent's website contains several elements suggesting that the Respondent's website is inauthentic with the Respondent pretending to be a "United States-based designer", while the Respondent's website contains several Chinese elements. The disclosed underlying registrant details indicate that the Respondent is indeed based in Hong Kong, China, with no apparent connection to the United States as claimed on the Respondent's website. The Complainant submits that there is a risk that the so-called "MetaAI" service which offers "iChat" may be being used to distribute malware or to phish for Internet users' personal details.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Accordingly, the Panel considers it can proceed to determine the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant as per paragraph 15(a) of the Rules. The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here "ai" and "360") 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. It has also long been held that gTLDs are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

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.

Although 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 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds 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.

There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent used or is currently using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does the Respondent appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy. Rather, according to the uncontested evidence produced by the Complainant, the disputed domain name was used to resolve to a web page entitled "MetaAI" that offered to try its "iChat" service, similar to the "Meta AI" assistant services offered by the Complainant. In addition, the Respondent uses the Complainant's META trademark in the disputed domain name together with the letters "ai" and the Respondent's website also features a graphic which is highly similar to the Complainant's META logo and figurative trademark with the wording "MetaAI" featured under the graphic. Such use risks misleading Internet users into believing that the Respondent's website is operated by the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name (incorporating the Complainant's trademark META in its entirety with the addition of the term "ai", and "360"), together with the display of the Complainant's META trademark and its distinctive figurative trademark (whether through direct reproduction or modified variation) on the website at the disputed domain name, coupled with the use of the disputed domain name, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

The Respondent is reportedly called "鎧屹 巫, WU KAIYI" and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, claiming any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of its META trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The record also shows that the Complainant's META trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized. Thus, given the evidence in the case file, the Panel finds it highly unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks, given the reputation of the Complainant and the composition of the disputed domain name and also given the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's META word trademark and a variation of the Complainant's figurative mark and offering purportedly similar services. The

Panel finds on balance that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's trademark.

As regards the use, the Respondent reproduced the Complainant's trademark and logo on the website associated with the disputed domain name and purported to offer similar services. By doing so, it is clear the Respondent was intentionally seeking to attract Internet users for commercial gain through the creation of a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. The Panel also notes the un rebutted evidence submitted by the Complainant which shows that the website at the disputed domain name contained several elements suggesting that it was inauthentic as the Respondent pretended to be a "United States-based designer" (using for this purpose some text and graphic elements seemingly copied from a third-party website), while the website contained several Chinese elements, and the disclosed underlying registrant details indicate that the Respondent is based in Hong Kong, China, with no apparent connection to the United States as claimed on the Respondent's website. The Panel agrees with the Complainant that there is a risk that the so-called "MetaAI" service which offers "iChat" might be used to distribute malware or to phish for Internet users' personal details, noting also that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a webpage in Chinese displaying inter alia "META AI" and offering email subscriptions.

The fact that the disputed domain name previously resolved to webpage titled "META AI" offering email subscriptions and at present no longer resolves to an active website does not change the Panel's findings.

The Panel finds that the 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 name <metaai360.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: May 4, 2026