

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. THANH TRAN DAI
Case No. D2026-2149

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Meta Platforms, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Perkins Coie, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is THANH TRAN DAI, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fb2fa.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 19, 2026. On May 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Data Redacted) 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 22, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 the Respondent 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 Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on June 25, 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 is a technology company that owns and operates Facebook, an online social networking and social media platform. Facebook was founded in 2004 and provides services that enable users to communicate with friends and family, participate in online communities, discover information and events, and create and share content.

According to the Complainant, Facebook currently has more than three billion monthly active users and more than two billion average daily active users worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous FACEBOOK and FB trademark registrations, including:

- the International Trademark Registration for FACEBOOK (figurative trademark) No. 1075094, registered on July 16, 2010;
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for FACEBOOK (word trademark) No. 005585518, registered on May 25, 2011; and
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for FB (word trademark) No. 018146501, registered on November 7, 2020.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names incorporating its FACEBOOK and FB trademarks, including <facebook.com> and <fb-accounts.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on August 12, 2021.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a Thai-language website offering various digital products and online services, primarily relating to Facebook, including the sale of Facebook pages and accounts, follower and engagement services, and OTP-related services, as well as products relating to other online platforms (the "First Website"). The First Website also prominently displayed the FACEBOOK trademark and a variation of the stylized Facebook "f" logo in connection with the services offered.

As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name resolves to a Thai-language website promoting private tours in central Viet Nam, offering customized travel packages, Thai-speaking guides, and related travel services (the "Second Website").

The Panel further notes that, in March 2026, the Complainant sent cease-and-desist correspondence to the Respondent's web host or proxy web host. No substantive 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 Domain Name.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the 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 the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence"; some panels have also expressed this as an "on balance" standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel's satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. See section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant holds valid registrations for the FB trademark. The Domain Name incorporates this trademark in its entirety. As numerous UDRP panels have held, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The addition of the term "2fa" in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's FB trademark. Panels have consistently held that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".com" in the Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FB trademark. Thus, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made 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 prior to the notice of the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is 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.

In the present case, the Complainant's FB trademark registration predates the Respondent's registration of the Domain Name. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the FB trademark or to register the Domain Name incorporating this trademark.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to the First Website offering various digital products and online services, primarily relating to Facebook (but also to third-party online platforms), and prominently displaying the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark and a variation of the stylized Facebook "f" logo in connection with those services. Such use does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. The Panel further notes that the subsequent redirection of the Domain Name to the Second Website promoting private tours in Viet Nam does not alter this assessment.

Prior UDRP panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the "Oki Data test" (see *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)), the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

In the present case, the above requirements are not met. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's FB trademark together with the term "2fa", commonly understood to refer to "two-factor authentication", a security feature associated with online accounts and social media services, including Facebook. In the circumstances of this case, the Domain Name, together with the content of the First Website, clearly points to targeting of the Complainant. The First Website also did not accurately or prominently disclose the absence of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

Furthermore, there is no evidence that the First Website was actually offering the Complainant's goods or services at issue, and the services offered were not limited to those relating to the Complainant, but also extended to products and services associated with third-party platforms.

The Panel also observes that, as of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name resolves to the Second Website promoting private tours in Viet Nam. While this subsequent use does not affect the assessment of the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests as at the filing of the Complaint, it similarly does not support a finding that the Respondent has been making a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Domain Name. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not satisfy the cumulative requirements of the Oki Data test and does not confer on it any rights or legitimate interests.

Given the above, there are no circumstances in evidence which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. In sum, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided it is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Complainant's rights in the FB trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. This finding is supported by the incorporation of the Complainant's FB trademark in the Domain Name together with the term "2fa", commonly understood to refer to two-factor authentication, a security feature associated with online accounts and social media services, including Facebook. It is further supported by the Respondent's use of the Domain Name in connection with the First Website, which offered services primarily relating to Facebook and prominently displayed the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark and a variation of the stylized Facebook "f" logo.

Moreover, it has been proven to the Panel's satisfaction that the Complainant's FB trademark is well known. Thus, the Respondent could not reasonably ignore the reputation of this trademark, while offering Facebook-related services and displaying the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark and stylized Facebook "f" logo. In sum, the Respondent, more likely than not, registered the Domain Name with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's FB trademark.

The fact that, as of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name resolves to a different commercial website does not alter the Panel's assessment of the Respondent's bad-faith registration and use.

The Panel thus finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent to attract Internet users to the associated website. The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

For the reasons discussed above, 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 Domain Name <fb2fa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: July 2, 2026