ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Asad Seeker
Case No. D2026-3348

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Meta Platforms, Inc., United States of America, represented by Hogan Lovells Cadwalader (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondent is Asad Seeker, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <facebookgrabber.com> and <grabfacebookvid.com> are registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 28, 2026. On July 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 30, 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 (Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 3, 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 August 6, 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 August 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Harini Narayanswamy as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 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 social technology company and uses the trademark FACEBOOK to provide social networking services. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark which includes, among others:

FACEBOOK, Mexico Trademark Registration No. 1057105, registered on August 28, 2008, class 42;

FACEBOOK, United States of America Trademark Registration No. 3881770, registered on November 23, 2010, classes 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45; and

FACEBOOK, European Union Trademark Registration No. 5585518, registered on May 25, 2011, classes 35, 41, 42 and 45.

The Respondent is Azad Seeker. The record shows the two disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent on the same day, on April 22, 2026, and at the same time. The disputed domain names resolve to websites that purportedly provide tools for downloading video and other content from the Complainant's Facebook platform. Although the websites indicate that users are entitled to "1 free download", the websites nevertheless provide such tools on a commercial basis.

The disputed domain name <facebookgrabber.com> hosts a website that is titled "FYTDown" and displays the Complainant's "f" logo and figurative trademark with the subtitle "Download Facebook Videos & Reels Instantly". Users are prompted to paste a Facebook URL into a box, and click "Fetch info" to download video content and reels from Facebook. The website has a black background and displays the Complainant's logo in the blue and white colours, which is similar to the blue and white colour scheme of the Complainant's platform.

The other disputed domain name <grabfacebookvid.com>, resolves to a website that is similar to the website at the disputed domain name <facebookgrabber.com>, and displays the same title "FYTDown". It also uses the Complainant's "f" logo and figurative trademark with the same blue and white themed colour scheme against a white background. One obvious difference between the two websites is that the word "Facebook" is featured in blue for the website linked to the disputed domain name <grabfacebookvid.com> and in red for the disputed domain name <facebookgrabber.com>.

The Respondent's websites make prominent reference to the Complainant's Facebook platform as follows:

"Save Facebook Video, Reels & Live streams in HD […]
Paste a Facebook video or Reel URL above, then click Fetch Info"

The websites also provide these step by step instructions to download video content and reels from the Complainant's Facebook platform:
"1. Paste the Facebook URL
Copy any Facebook video, Reel, or Live link and paste it into the input field above.
2. Fetch Video Info
Click Fetch Info to load the video preview — title, thumbnail, duration, and channel name.
3. Choose Format& Quality
Select Video (MP4) at your preferred resolution, or switch to Audio Only for MP3 or M4A.
4. Download
Hit the Download button. The file downloads directly to your device. Done."

The websites do not display any disclaimer regarding the relationship or the lack of it between the Complainant and the Respondent. The footer however states “For personal & educational use only. Respect copyright and each platforms Terms of Service.”

The Complainant sent a communication to the Respondent on June 22, 2026 via the Registrar’s registrant contact form for each of the disputed domain names. The Complainant asserts that no response was received by the Complainant for these communications sent to the Respondent.

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.

The Complainant states that its online social networking services operate from platforms like Facebook, Instagram, Meta, Quest and WhatsApp, with the aim to help people connect, find communities and grow businesses. The Complainant states that its META brand was launched on October 28, 2021.

The Complainant states that its FACEBOOK platform was launched in 2004 and by the end of 2004 it had one million users. Access to Facebook was originally restricted to students at Harvard University and it quickly expanded to other universities. By September 2012, it had 100 million users in August 2008, 500 million users by July 2010. In December 2023, Facebook had over a three billion monthly active users. Facebook is available for mobile devices and is consistently ranked as a top mobile application. The Facebook brand was ranked 21st and 19th in Interbrand’s Best Global Brands reports of 2024 and 2025 respectively.

The Complainant contends that given the exclusive online nature of its social-networking business, it owns several domain names consisting of its various trademarks, including the FACEBOOK mark. These domain names are crucial to its business and for its users to avail themselves of its services. The Complainant states that it has made substantial investments to develop a strong online presence and is active on various social media platforms. The Facebook page on Facebook, has over 154 million followers and its official Facebook page on the X platform has over 650,000 followers.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names which contain the FACEBOOK trademark are confusingly similar to the mark. The additional terms are not sufficient to dispel confusing similarity.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and is not a licensee or authorized user of its mark. The Complainant argues that the Respondent is not offering bona fide services, as the Respondent’s websites purport to provide unauthorized Facebook downloader tools. The Complainant further argues that the use of the disputed domain names does not meet the reseller distributor test under the *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.,* WIPO Case No. D2001-0903, (the “Oki data test”) principles of nominative fair use.

The Complainant contends the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names are in bad faith. The Complainant requests for transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has filed evidence of trademark registrations for the FACEBOOK mark and has accordingly 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 that the FACEBOOK mark is reproduced in both disputed domain names with the addition of other terms "grabber", "grab" and "vid". Although the addition of other terms here, "grabber", "grab" and "vid" 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purpose of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. 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.

The Complainant has asserted that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, arguing that: (i) Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names; (ii) the Respondent is using the disputed domain names for enabling download of content from its platform, which is prohibited under the terms of use of its services; (iii) The Complainant has no business connection or relationship with the Respondent; and (iv) The Complainant has not licenced, authorized or consented to use of its mark in any manner by the Respondent.

The Panel finds from the material on record that the provisions under paragraph 4 (c) Policy that exemplify manners in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests are not applicable to the circumstances here given the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names. The composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, and the disputed domain names are used by the Respondent to attract users to the Respondent's websites for commercial use. In the Panel's view, the Respondent's websites, which purportedly provide downloader tools to download content from the Complainant's platform, puts users at risk and cannot be considered bona fide, legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as providing unauthorized tools that may put Internet users at risk, including security risks, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Moreover, in the Panel's view, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names does not meet the requirements of the Oki data test. The websites in the present case do not accurately disclose that the Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant. Although the Respondent's websites state in the footer "For personal & educational use only. Respect copyright and each platforms Terms of Service", the websites are clearly of commercial nature, and such statement does nothing as to disclose the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

For all the reasons discussed, 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.

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, having reviewed the record the Panel finds the Complainant's FACEBOOK mark is distinctive, has been used extensively and is known worldwide. The Facebook platform has billions of users. The mark was adopted and used by the Complainant since 2004, which is more than two decades of prior use.

Other evidence of the Respondent's knowledge of Facebook, is the content of the Respondent's websites which are replete with use of the FACEBOOK mark and references to Facebook. The websites also displays the Complainant's logo, uses the stylized letter "f" in blue, which the Respondent as noted above, does not have authorization to use. Given the fame of the mark, the composition and use of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith under the Policy provisions.

The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names evidences bad faith as described under paragraph 4 (b)(iv) of the Policy, which is to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to an online location for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

As discussed in the previous section, the Respondent's websites, which purportedly provide downloader tools to download content from the Complainant's platform, may put users at risk, and such use cannot be considered bona fide or a legitimate activity. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Under the described circumstances, the Respondent's failure to respond, and the use of a privacy service to conceal its identity are additional factors to support a finding of bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

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 <facebookgrabber.com> and <grabfacebookvid.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Harini Narayanswamy/
Harini Narayanswamy
Sole Panelist
Date: September 16, 2026