

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Man Lam

Case No. D2026-3371

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Meta Platforms, Inc., United States of America, represented by Ashurst Perkins Coie US LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Man Lam, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accountfb.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 July 29, 2026. On July 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 3, 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 August 6, 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 August 6, 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 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 3, 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 social technology company and uses the trademarks FACEBOOK and FB to provide social networking services. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the FACEBOOK and FB marks. Trademark registrations for FB include among others:

FB, Brazilian Trademark Registration No. 918596068, registered on August 18, 2020.

FB, United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003441474, registered on March 20, 2020.

FB, European Union Trademark Registration No. 18146501, registered on November 7, 2020.

The Respondent is Man Lam of Da Nang, Viet Nam. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 22, 2025. At the time of filing the present Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website purportedly offering Facebook accounts for sale and prominently displaying the Complainant's marks on the website.

The Respondent's website states: "Welcome to Facebook 2FA Account Store" and mentions that it is a "Clone Facebook Store". The website also states:

"We guarantee that 99% of the products on our website are created by us; no hacking, no account manipulation, and no scanning. 99 % are registered and maintained by us."

The website replicates the FACEBOOK mark, the FACEBOOK design logo with the blue and white colour akin to the Complainant's trade dress.

The Complainant sent communication and notices to the Respondent in July 2025 and again in June 2026 through the domain name owner contact form provided by the Registrar, requesting the Respondent to cease unauthorized use of the FACEBOOK trademarks and requesting for transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not reply to the communications sent by the Complainant.

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.

The Complainant states that it is a leading provider of online social networking services and its Facebook brand is ranked 21st in Interbrand's best Global Brands report of 2024. The FACEBOOK platform was launched in 2004 and the Complainant states it rapidly gained one million users by the end of 2004. In August 2008, it had 100 million users and 500 million users by July 2010 and one billion users worldwide by September 2012, and over two billion users as of September 2018. Presently, Facebook has over three billion monthly active users and over two billion daily active users on average.

The Complainant contends that given the nature of its social-networking business, it owns several domain names under a wide range of generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs") consisting of its various trademarks, including the FACEBOOK and the FB trademarks. The

Complainant alleges that its mark has garnered considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide due to its substantial investments and is active on various social media platforms, including Facebook official page and Instagram which have millions of followers.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name contains the FB trademark which is often used as an abbreviation of its Facebook platform and is confusingly similar to the mark in which it owns well-established registered trademark rights. The additional term “account”, the Complainant argues, is a term connected with its core business, and does not dispel confusing similarity.

The Complainant states that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the Respondent’s website displays the FACEBOOK mark, design logo and uses the blue and white colour of the Complainant’s trade dress to confuse Internet users of a likely association or affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not a licensee or an authorized user of the Complainant’s trademarks and logos that are used on the Respondent’s website. The Complainant argues that the Respondent is not offering bona fide services, but is trying to impersonate the trademark owner in an attempt to sell illegitimate Facebook accounts. As the terms of the Complainant’s platform has expressly prohibited the sale or transfer of accounts on its platform, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent is trying to create an illegal secondary market of Facebook accounts and its services have been flagged by cybersecurity vendors as malicious. The Complainant argues that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is not covered under the *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), (“Okidata”) principles of nominative fair use.

The Complainant contends the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith. Using the Complainant’s mark for purposes of unauthorized sale of the Complainant’s accounts is not a bona fide or legitimate offering to users. The Complainant states that the Respondent offers “illicitly generated, compromised, or pre-aged Facebook accounts”, which are “derivative, competing services” that misleads Internet users.

The Complainant further states that the services or accounts sold by the Respondent are designed to bypass identity verification and are accounts with artificially inflated advertising spends limits, which directly undermine the integrity, security and trustworthiness of the Complainant’s platform. The Complainant’s platform expressly prohibits the sale or transfer of accounts, and therefore the Respondent is in violation of the Complainant’s platform’s terms of use and policies, which is disruptive to the Complainant’s business and exploits the mark in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Three elements that need to be established by the Complainant, in order to obtain the remedy of transfer of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are:

The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[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 Panel finds that the FB mark is reproduced in the disputed domain name with an additional term "account". Although the term "account" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the term 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.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is 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 name, arguing that: (i) Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; (ii) The Respondent is using the disputed domain name for selling Facebook accounts, 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 do not apply to the facts of the case. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name and the linked website to offer Facebook accounts for sale. The Respondent is engaged in activity that is prohibited under terms of use of the Facebook platform. Such activity compromises the integrity and use of the Facebook's platform and it also poses a security risk for users of the platform. In the Panel's view, this constitutes illegitimate activity which cannot be termed bona fide, legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as knowingly circumventing terms of use of a platform, putting users at risk, including security risks is not legitimate activity and can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Complainant has argued that the use of the disputed domain name is not covered under the Okidata principles of fair use and stated that the Respondent cannot be considered a bona fide reseller of the Complainant's services. The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent is not providing legitimate

sales or repairs in relation to a product provided by the Complainant, but attempts to offer Facebook accounts, which are not products or services of legitimate resale. Facebook prohibits account transfers or resale in a secondary market and therefore use of the disputed domain name for this purpose does not constitute bona fide offering of goods and services. The Complainant has also submitted that the Respondent's services has been identified as "malicious", by cyber security vendors.

In the Panel's view, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names does not fulfil the requirements of the Okidata test.

Furthermore, the website in the present case does not accurately disclose the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant. Even if such disclaimer were to be made by the Respondent, it would not absolve the Respondent's underlying illegitimate activity and the unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark and the Complainant's stylized logos, which is likely to mislead users that the Respondent's website is somehow affiliated or endorsed by 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 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 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.

The Panel finds the Complainant's FACEBOOK and FB marks are distinctive and have been used extensively by the Complainant. The Facebook platform has billions of users and is known worldwide. The Respondent's knowledge of the Facebook platform and the Complainant's prior rights in the trademarks is evident from the content on the Respondent's websites which are replete with use of the FACEBOOK and FB trademarks and has numerous references to Facebook and its accounts.

The Panel finds that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to offer Facebook accounts for sale and has prominently displayed on the website "Clone Facebook Store" and "Facebook 2FA Account Store". The Panel further finds the Respondent's website content uses the Complainant's design mark, logos that are replicated in blue and white, colours similar to trade dress of the Complainant which demonstrates knowledge of the mark and using it in connection with illicit activity of offering Facebook accounts for a price.

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 attract Internet users to an online location for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users to the Respondent's websites.

Given the fame of the mark, the composition and use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent. Under the described circumstances, the Respondent's failure to respond, and the use of proxy services to conceal identity are additional reasons to find 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 name <accountfb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Harini Narayanswamy/

Harini Narayanswamy

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2026