ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Meta Platforms, Inc. v. le hoang long
Case No. D2026-1164

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 le hoang long, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <clonemeta.net> is registered with P.A. Viet Nam Company Limited. The disputed domain name <tutfb.net> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar(s)").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint as regards the disputed domain name <tutfb.net> was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 18, 2026. On March 18, 2026 the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <tutfb.net>. On March 20, 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 ("Thanh Hoa") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 20, 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 April 1, 2026, submitting a request for addition of the disputed domain name <clonemeta.net> into the proceeding.

On April 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <clonemeta.net>. On April 2, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 7, 2026, disclosing the additional registrant information for the Complainant's information.

On April 7, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <tutfb.net> is English, and the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <clonemeta.net> is Vietnamese. The Complainant sent an email communication on April 8, 2026, and the Respondent did not comment on the language of the proceeding.

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 April 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on May 1, 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 the 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.

Founded in 2004, the Complainant's Facebook platform is a leading provider of online social-media and social-networking services which allows Internet users to stay connected with friends and family, and to share information mainly via its website available at "www.facebook.com". The Complainant's Facebook platform is also available for mobile devices and in recent years has consistently ranked amongst the top "apps" in the market. For instance, it was the 4th most downloaded mobile application worldwide, as per Data.ai's "Top Apps Ranking in 2025". The term "FB" commonly refers to the Complainant's Facebook platform and has been used by international publications.

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 the Complainant'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, FB, and FACEBOOK including the following:

- 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 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. 018146501, for FB (word), registered on November 7, 2020, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45;
- United Kingdom Trademark No. UK00003441474, for FB (word), registered on March 20, 2020, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45;
- Vietnamese Trademark No. 4-0128158-000, for FACEBOOK (combined), registered on June 26, 2009, in international classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42, and 45; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1075807, for FACEBOOK (word), registered on July 16, 2010, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45.

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

The disputed domain name <clonemeta.net> was registered on April 1, 2024 and the disputed domain name <tutfb.net> was registered on September 4, 2024. According to the evidence in the Complaint, both disputed domain names resolve to websites in Vietnamese language (with an option to switch to English and/or other languages) purportedly offering for sale of cloned Facebook accounts featuring the Complainant's FB or

META mark, official logo, and figurative trademark without a visible and accurate disclaimer describing the (lack of) relationship between the Parties.

On January 30, 2026, the Complainant's lawyers sent an abuse notice regarding the disputed domain name <tutfb.net> but no response was received.

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 contends that it owns trademark registrations for META and FB in various jurisdictions, and that it has therefore established trademark rights for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Complainant's META and FB trademarks, preceded by the terms "clone" and "tut" (likely meaning "drop" in Vietnamese), under the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net" and that the addition of such terms to its META and FB trademarks does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with its trademarks, which remain clearly recognizable in the disputed domain names.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, and that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorisation for the Respondent to make use of its META or FB trademarks, in a domain name or otherwise. Furthermore, taking into account that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to divert Internet users to its websites that purport to offer for sale various types of bundled accounts, including Facebook clone accounts, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is unable to be viewed as a bona fide service provider. Rather, the Respondent is making unauthorised use of the Complainant's trademarks to market its own ancillary services (i.e., selling Facebook and Instagram clone accounts). Even if the Oki Data principles would apply, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has failed to observe these, because the Respondent's websites purport to offer for sale various types of bundled accounts, including clone accounts for the Complainant's Facebook and Instagram platforms. As such, the Respondent cannot be said to be using its websites to offer the goods or services at issue, namely the Complainant's social media services. Furthermore, the Respondent's websites also refer to other third-party services, such as TikTok and YouTube, therefore the Respondent is not using its websites to sell only the trademarked goods or services, and also the Respondent's websites do not accurately or prominently disclose any lack of affiliation with the Complainant, as no visible disclaimer is displayed. On the contrary, by featuring the Complainant's distinctive logos (whether reproduced or modified) and expressly referencing its META and FACEBOOK trademarks, the websites at the disputed domain names create a misleading impression of an affiliation with the Complainant, which is not the case. 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, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, respectively, given the use described above, the Respondent is clearly obtaining financial gain from such use of the disputed domain names, which is commercial in nature.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant contends 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 FACEBOOK trademark is highly distinctive and famous throughout the world. It has been continuously and extensively used since 2004 in connection with the Complainant's social network, having rapidly acquired considerable goodwill and reputation worldwide, including in Viet Nam. Furthermore, the Complainant's FB trademark is commonly used to refer to the Complainant's Facebook platform, and has also acquired substantial goodwill and global recognition. Therefore, the Complainant submits that the Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant's META and FB trademarks when registering the disputed domain names in 2024. Moreover, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names clearly targets the Complainant's social media platforms such as Facebook and Instagram, and

strongly suggests that the Respondent intended to create confusion with the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain names. As regards the use, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names, which are confusingly similar to the Complainant's META and FB trademarks, to redirect Internet users to its websites offering, inter alia, Facebook clone accounts for sale, and that the websites at the disputed domain names also feature multiple references to the Complainant's META and FACEBOOK or FB trademarks, as well as its figurative trademarks and logos, whether by direct reproduction or by way of modification, in the absence of any disclaimer clarifying its lack of relationship with the Complainant. In this way, the Complainant submits that the 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 the Complainant's trademarks and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites and services offered therein, in bad faith, pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <tutfb.net> is English, and the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <clonemeta.net> is Vietnamese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that (i) the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve prominently display English terms, including "Check live FB", "Icon Facebook", and "Random Face", which suggests that the Respondent is familiar with the English language; (ii) the disputed domain name <clonemeta.net> comprises the English term "clone", which further indicates the Respondent's ability to understand English; and (iii) it would be disproportionate to require the Complainant, an international business which operates primarily in English, to translate and submit the Complaint in Vietnamese as this would result in additional expenses and unnecessary delay for the Complainant.

The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request for the language of the proceeding to be English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, including the fact that the disputed domain names consist of Latin letters, rather than Vietnamese characters, and the presence of terms in English language on the websites at the disputed domain names, as well as options to switch to English language, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive matters

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 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 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.

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 names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademarks META and FB for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's META, and respectively FB, trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "clone", respectively "tut") 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 marks 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 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.

There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent is currently using the disputed domain names 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 names 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 names resolve to webpages which purport to sell social media accounts including the Complainant's Facebook accounts, displaying the Complainant's META and respectively FACEBOOK or FB trademarks and logos. The Panel agrees with the Complainant's arguments that the Oki Data criteria are not met, namely the Respondent's websites purport to offer for sale various types of bundled accounts, including clone accounts for the Complainant's Facebook and Instagram platforms hence the Respondent cannot be said to be using its websites to bona fide offer the goods or services at issue, namely the Complainant's social media services. Furthermore, the Respondent's websites also refer to other third-party services, such as TikTok and YouTube, therefore the Respondent is not using its websites to sell only the trademarked goods or services, and also the Respondent's websites do not accurately or prominently disclose any lack of affiliation with the Complainant, as no visible disclaimer is provided.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names (incorporating the Complainant's trademark META, respectively FB, in their entirety with the addition of the terms "clone", respectively "tut"), together with the display of the Complainant's META or FB trademarks and its distinctive figurative trademarks (whether through direct reproduction or modified variation) on the website at the disputed domain names, carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The Respondent is allegedly called "le hoang long" and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names 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 names.

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 and FB trademarks long predate the registration of the disputed domain names. The record also shows that the Complainant's META, FACEBOOK, and FB 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 names were registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks, given the reputation of the Complainant and the composition of the disputed domain names and also given the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to resolve to websites prominently displaying the Complainant's META and/or FB word trademarks and the Complainant's figurative mark or variation thereof and making express reference to the Complainant's services. The Panel finds on balance that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the expectation of taking advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks.

As regards the use, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to resolve to websites which prominently display the META, FACEBOOK, or FB trademarks and logos on the homepage, and purportedly offer fake or cloned accounts for the Complainant's social media network without any authorization from the Complainant, are clear indications that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the META, FACEBOOK, and FB trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website, which is indicative of bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, given all the particular circumstances of this case, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names <clonemeta.net> and <tutfb.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/
Mihaela Maravela
Sole Panelist
Date: May 8, 2026