

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Mr. Ngo Van Cong (Ngô Văn Công)
Case No. D2026-2143

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 Mr. Ngo Van Cong (Ngô Văn Công), Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <meta2fa.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with iNET Software Company Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 18, 2026. On May 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 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 (Domain Admin, C/O ID#10760, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 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 in English on May 22, 2026.

On May 20, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Vietnamese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Vietnamese. On May 22, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Vietnamese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac as the sole panelist in this matter on June 26, 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

The Complainant, Meta Platforms, Inc., is a leading United States technology company operating, among others, the Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, and Meta platforms. Since its launch in 2004, Facebook has become one of the world's largest social networking services, with more than 3 billion monthly active users worldwide. The Complainant has established a substantial global reputation and maintains a significant online presence through its official websites and social media channels.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for META and FACEBOOK in multiple jurisdictions, including, among others, Vietnamese Trademark Registration No. 128158 (registered on June 26, 2009) and United States Trademark Registration No. 3,734,637 (registered on January 5, 2010) for FACEBOOK mark, together with various registrations for META worldwide including Andorran Trademark Registration No. 43626 (registered on January 3, 2022) and Monegasque Trademark Registration No. 2200039 (registered on February 8, 2022).

The Complainant also owns and operates numerous domain names incorporating its META and FACEBOOK trademarks, including <meta.com> and <facebook.com>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on February 21, 2023. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a Vietnamese-language website purportedly offering for sale of various online accounts, including clone accounts for Facebook, Instagram, LLC (the Complainant's affiliated company), and for third-party services such as Hotmail and Outlook, through different pricing packages. The website displays the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademarks and logo without authorization and does not contain any clear disclaimer indicating the absence of affiliation with the Complainant.

On March 20, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent using the email address on the website at the Disputed Domain Name, but received no response. The Complainant subsequently filed this Complaint seeking transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that each of the elements specified in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in the present case, as follows:

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark, in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for META, which establish its rights for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's META trademark in its entirety, followed only by the number "2" and the letters "fa" (together commonly understood as a reference to "two-factor authentication"). The Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Under sections 1.7 and 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), the addition of descriptive or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") (".com") is a standard registration requirement and should be disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

Although the content of the associated website is generally not relevant under the first element, the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to offer Facebook-related accounts further confirms that the Respondent intentionally targets the Complainant and its trademarks.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's META trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized by, or otherwise licensed by the Complainant to use the META trademark, and none of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy applies to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to operate a commercial website offering Facebook clone accounts and related services. Such use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name and has no apparent trademark rights in META or META2FA.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that it has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with full knowledge of the Complainant's well-known META trademark. The Disputed Domain Name was registered long after the Complainant acquired trademark rights, and the Respondent's website prominently displays the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademarks and logo, demonstrating that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, to a website offering Facebook clone accounts and related services by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The absence of any disclaimer, together with the Respondent's use of a privacy service and failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, further supports a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

With the said arguments, the Complainant requests that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name 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 English be the language of the proceeding on the grounds that: (i) the Disputed Domain Name is registered under the ".com" gTLD and incorporates the Complainant's META trademark together with the English abbreviation "2fa" (two-factor authentication); (ii) the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name contains English-language content; and (iii) the Complainant is a United States company whose operating language is English, and requiring translation of the Complaint and supporting evidence into Vietnamese would cause unnecessary cost and delay.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

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 3.1](#)", section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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.

Regarding the term "2fa", from the Panel's own check, this is a technical term, often refers to "two-factor authentication - a security method that requires you to provide two distinct forms of identification to access an account". The Panel finds that the addition of the term "2fa" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In addition, the Panel determines that the addition of the gTLD ".com" in the Disputed Domain Name is disregarded, as it is viewed as a technical necessity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that 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 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.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists circumstances, in particular but without limitation, which, if found by the Panel to be proved, demonstrate the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, including:

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

Regarding paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the Panel finds, based on the Complainant’s submissions and supporting evidence, that the Respondent has not been granted any license, permission, or authorization to use the Complainant’s FACEBOOK or META trademark. Further, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that the Respondent owns any registered or unregistered trademark rights in any jurisdiction in respect of the term “Meta” or “Meta2fa”. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no trademark rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to attract Internet users to a website offering, among other things, Facebook accounts for sale, thereby trading on the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademarks and business. The Respondent is not offering authorized goods or services of the Complainant, the website purports to sell accounts relating to third-party platforms, and it does not accurately disclose the absence of any relationship with the Complainant. The Panel notes that similar conduct has previously been found not to constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services in *Meta Platforms, Inc. v. 1*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2634](#).

With such a view, the Panel finds that the unauthorized use of the Disputed Domain Name does not constitute a bona fide use within paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Regarding paragraphs 4(c)(ii) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, the Panel finds no evidence that the Respondent, whether as an individual, business, or other organization, has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, nor is there any indication that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. The evidence indicates that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used with knowledge of the Complainant's META trademark and with the intention of capitalizing on the goodwill and reputation associated with that trademark.

The Panel finds that 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, including:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you 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 Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has not submitted a response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's evidence.

The Panel has considered the Complainant's assertions and evidence concerning the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel notes that the Complainant's FACEBOOK and META trademarks have been registered and used in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including Viet Nam, where the Respondent resides, and has acquired a significant recognition in the technology sector. These trademark rights and their associated reputation predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's META trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the “2fa” which is an abbreviation of “two-factor authentication”. Given the distinctiveness of the META trademark and its well-known reputation in Facebook social network and technology, including in Viet Nam where the Respondent resides, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks. On the contrary, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and deliberately chose the Disputed Domain Name in order to create an association with the Complainant.

The Panel further notes that the Disputed Domain Name does not currently resolve to an active website, but the Complainant has adduced evidence that at the time of preparation of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to commercial website purportedly offering for sale, among other things, Facebook clone accounts and related services. The website displays the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademarks and

logo without authorization, while containing no disclaimer explaining the absence of any relationship with the Complainant. Such use is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Panel determines that Internet users searching for the Complainant's META services or products are likely to be attracted to the Respondent's website due to the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark, and to mistakenly assume a commercial connection between the Respondent and the Complainant, while no such connection exists in fact. The Panel therefore finds that, by using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and the products offered thereon. This conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. This finding is consistent with prior UDRP decisions involving the Complainant, where panels found that the use of domain names to offer Facebook or other social media accounts for sale constitutes bad faith. (See *Meta Platforms, Inc. v. 1 1*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2634](#) and *Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Nguyen Thanh Dien*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3099](#)). Similarly, in *Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Nguyen Tien Tung*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4438](#), the panel found that the offer of cloned or fake accounts targeting the Complainant's Facebook platform indicated an intention to mislead Internet users and exploit the Complainant's rights.

The Panel also considers that the sale and transfer of social media accounts may involve the unauthorized disclosure or transfer of account credentials and associated personal data, creating risks to the security and privacy of users. In the circumstances, the Respondent's operation of a website purportedly offering Facebook clone accounts and accounts of third party for sale further supports the finding that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and 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 Name <meta2fa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac/

Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac

Sole Panelist

Date: July 10, 2026