ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Meta Platforms, Inc v. Jack Ken
Case No. D2026-4376

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 Jack Ken, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <facebook996.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 28, 2026. On September 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 30, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 October 5, 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 October 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin as the sole panelist in this matter on November 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 following summary sets out the uncontested factual submission made by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant (formerly Facebook, Inc.) is a corporation based in California, United States, known globally for operating Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus) and WhatsApp, and focusing on connecting people and supporting online communities and businesses.

4.2 The Complainant's Facebook platform, founded in 2004, is one of the world's leading social media and social networking services, accessed by approximately 3.07 billion monthly active users and 2.11 billion daily active users globally as of May 2026. Facebook is also available for mobile devices and has consistently ranked as one of the top applications downloaded worldwide.

4.3 The Complainant's Facebook platform enjoys substantial worldwide recognition, including in Indonesia, where the Complainant's services and trademarks have been extensively promoted and are widely known.

4.4 The Complainant owns a range of domain names incorporating its FACEBOOK trademarks across various generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs") and has a strong presence on multiple leading social media platforms, including having over 154 million followers on its Facebook page and 7.6 million on Instagram. Thes pages are available at the following URLs:

"www.facebook.com/facebook"
"www.instagram.com/facebook"
"www.x.com/facebook"
"www.youtube.com/facebookapp"

4.5 The Complainant has secured trademark registrations for FACEBOOK (the "Trademark") in multiple jurisdictions. The following table includes a sample of registrations of the Trademark by the Complainant (whether on its own or through its related or associated company) in selected jurisdictions:

Jurisdiction	**Mark**	**Registration Number**	**Date of Registration**	**Classification of Goods / Services**
United States	FACEBOOK	3041791	January 10, 2006	38
Indonesia	FACEBOOK	IDM000336822	August 4, 2020	45
China	FACEBOOK	19118856	March 21, 2017	45
International	FACEBOOK	1075807	July 16, 2010	9, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 45

4.6 The disputed domain name was registered on June 17, 2026. Following registrar verification, the underlying registrant was disclosed as the Respondent identified in this proceeding.

4.7 The disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering various online accounts, including Facebook accounts, for sale. The website makes repeated reference to the Complainant and contains no prominent or accurate disclaimer indicating any lack of affiliation with the Complainant.

4.8 On September 9, 2026, the Complainant's legal representatives sent an abuse notice to the Respondent using the Registrar's contact form, but 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends, inter alia, as follows:

5.1 The Complainant asserts that the Trademark is identical or confusingly similar to the Trademark for the following reasons:

(a) the entirety of the Trademark is present in the disputed domain name;

(b) the addition of the number "996" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the Trademark is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name; and

(c) the gTLD ".com" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessment under the first element.

5.2 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because:

(a) the Respondent is not a licensee, affiliated, or otherwise connected with the Complainant in any way;

(b) the Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to make use of the Trademark in a domain name or otherwise;

(c) the disputed domain name is used to redirect users to a third-party website offering the sale of social media accounts, including Facebook accounts, which the Complainant submits is not a bona fide offering of goods or services and trades upon its reputation;

(d) the website uses the Trademark and other logos and marks identical or similar to the Complainant's trademark and does not prominently or accurately disclose an absence of an affiliation;

(e) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and no evidence of rights in the disputed domain name exists; and

(f) given the nature of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the number "996", and the contents of the Respondent's website, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to exploit the goodwill and reputation associated with the Trademark by creating a false impression of association with the Complainant. Such use does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and is clearly commercial, intended for financial gain from misleading diversion of consumers and is neither legitimate noncommercial nor fair use.

5.3 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith and relies on the following:

(a) the Trademark is highly distinctive and well known internationally. Given the fame of the Trademark and its incorporation in its entirety in the disputed domain name, the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain name;

(b) the use of the disputed domain name demonstrates an intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement by the Complainant;

(c) the Respondent failed to respond to the abuse notice, suggesting bad faith;

(d) the Respondent's supplied registration address appears incomplete, reinforcing an inference of bad faith; and

(e) even had there been a disclaimer on the website, it would not cure the fundamentally illegitimate use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit any Response or otherwise reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant is required to establish the following elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

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

(b) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(c) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 entirety of the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms, here the number "996", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that neither the addition of such term nor the use of the gTLD prevents a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.8 and 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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.

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.

There is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has been authorised, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the Trademark. Nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering various account-related services, including Facebook accounts for sale. The website makes numerous references to the Trademark and also refers to other social media platforms. The website does not contain any clear disclaimer accurately disclosing the absence of any relationship with the Complainant.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the goodwill associated with the Trademark.

The Panel further notes that, even assuming the Respondent could seek to rely on principles developed in certain UDRP cases concerning resellers or service providers, the evidence would not support such a claim. The website promotes services relating to multiple social media platforms and does not prominently or accurately disclose the absence of any relationship with the Complainant. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to capitalise on the goodwill associated with the Trademark.

Nor does the evidence support a finding that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use is plainly commercial in nature and is designed to attract Internet users by reference to the Trademark.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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.

Past panels often cite paragraph 4(b)(iv) as one of the circumstances to substantiate evidence of bad faith registration and use. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement

of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location, then this would justify a finding of bad faith.

The Panel recognizes the substantial goodwill associated with the Trademark and finds that the Respondent more likely than not sought to take unfair advantage of that goodwill. This conclusion is supported by the following factors:

(a) the Trademark is highly distinctive and enjoys extensive international reputation, having been used on a substantial scale for many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name;

(b) the disputed domain name incorporates the Trademark in its entirety, together with only the number "996", which does not prevent recognition of the Trademark within the disputed domain name;

(c) the Respondent has not been authorised by the Complainant to use the Trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it;

(d) the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering, among other things, Facebook accounts for sale and prominently referencing the Complainant's Trademark;

(e) the website contains no prominent disclaimer accurately disclosing the absence of any relationship with the Complainant; and

(f) the Respondent has failed to provide any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name despite having the opportunity to do so in this proceeding.

Taken together, these circumstances satisfy the Panel that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its Trademark when registering the disputed domain name and registered it with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's rights.

The Panel further finds that, through the use of the disputed domain name for a website purportedly offering account-related services, including Facebook accounts, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <facebook996.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin/
Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin
Sole Panelist
Date: November 13, 2026