

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. tian tong yu
Case No. D2026-3622

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is tian tong yu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <facebook-tv.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 13, 2026. On August 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 16, 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 (Unknown, The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 21, 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 25, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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

The Complainant is a United States social technology company. The Complainant's Facebook platform ("Facebook"), founded in 2004, is a leading provider of online social-media and social-networking services. Since its launch, Facebook has rapidly developed considerable renown and goodwill worldwide. Today, it has approximately 3.07 billion monthly active users and 2.11 billion daily active users on average worldwide. Currently inaccessible in mainland China, where the Respondent appears to be based, Facebook is far from an unknown name to the Chinese public, particularly considering numerous Chinese press articles (including People's Daily) on its success and popularity worldwide.

The Complainant has secured ownership of trademark registrations for the word trademark FACEBOOK in various jurisdictions, including United States Trademark Registration No. 3041791 (registered on January 10, 2006), International Trademark Registration No. 1075807 (registered on July 16, 2010), and Chinese Trademark Registration No. 19118856 (registered on March 21, 2017). The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names consisting of or including its FACEBOOK trademark, registered under various generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") as well as under a number of country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs").

The disputed domain name was registered on April 6, 2026. The Complainant has provided screenshots, taken on August 11, 2026, showing the disputed domain name resolved to a website that purports to provide free access to live streaming content covering major sporting events, including football and basketball matches. At the bottom of its homepage, the Respondent's website displays a copyright notice referring to JRS Live ("jrs 直播网"), which appears to be an unconnected Chinese platform providing free live streaming services to fans, covering major sporting events such as the FIFA World Cup and NBA games. Aside from this reference, the website provides no additional contact details or any clear and prominent disclaimer accurately disclosing the absence of relationship with the Complainant.

On June 17, 2026, the Complainant's lawyers sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent using an email address of the Registrar, as provided in the public WhoIs. 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 name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights on the following grounds. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark in its entirety, followed by a hyphen and the term "tv", under the gTLD ".com". The presence of the FACEBOOK trademark in the disputed domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. The additional elements, such as the hyphen and the term "tv", do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark, which remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the following grounds. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent's name does not bear any resemblance to the disputed domain name. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has not secured or sought to secure any trademark rights in "facebook", "facebook-tv" or any variation thereof. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, and is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its FACEBOOK trademark in a domain name or otherwise. The disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, as Internet users are likely to understand the additional term "tv" as referring to a television or video-related service offered by, or otherwise associated with, the Complainant. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, to redirect the public to a third-party website providing free access to live streaming content covering major sporting events, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith on the following grounds. 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. The fact that access to the Facebook website is blocked in mainland China is irrelevant to the Respondent's presumed knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark, particularly given numerous Chinese press articles (including People's Daily) on the Complainant's success and popularity published long before the disputed domain name was registered. The Respondent cannot credibly argue that it was not aware of the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark when registering the disputed domain name in 2026. Having no authorization to use the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights and with the intention of trading off the reputation and goodwill attached to the Complainant and its business, thereby acting in bad faith. The Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's lawyers' cease and desist letter constitutes additional evidence of bad faith. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark in full, to intentionally attract Internet users who may be interested in Facebook-related services to the Respondent's website. It is more likely than not that the Respondent ultimately derives commercial advantage from the Respondent's unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name. By using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent has created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The lack of disclaimer or any other indication on the Respondent's website clarifying the Respondent's relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant further adds to the confusion caused by the disputed domain name and constitutes additional evidence of the Respondent's intentional bad faith conduct. Even if a prominent disclaimer had been featured on the Respondent's website, it would not have been sufficient to cure the Respondent's illegitimate use of the disputed domain name.

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 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. It is the owner of a trademark registration for the word trademark FACEBOOK.

The entirety of the Complainant's word trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the addition only of a hyphen, the letters "tv", and the gTLD ".com". The Complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the addition of the hyphen and the letters "tv" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its FACEBOOK trademark. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolved to a webpage that purports to provide free access to live streaming content covering major sporting events. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in this way unfairly took advantage of the Complainant's trademark for the Respondent's benefit. Such use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Accordingly, such use does not confer on the Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has not rebutted this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name more than two decades after the Complainant first registered its trademark, and well after the trademark had become well known throughout the world; (ii) the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and merely adds a hyphen and the letters "tv", meaning the disputed domain name will be read by Internet users as referring to a television or video-related service provided by, or associated

with, the Complainant; (iii) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website purporting to provide access to live streaming content covering major sporting events; and (iv) the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letter and did not seek to dispute any of the assertions in the Complaint. It is clear the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, apparently for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

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 <facebook-tv.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: October 15, 2026