ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Meta Platforms, Inc. v. wukunming
Case No. D2026-4874

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is wukunming, China, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <metaforenterprise.com> is registered with 22net, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 26, 2026. On October 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 28, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 28, 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 in English on October 28, 2026.

On October 28, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On October 28, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding.

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 in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 29, 2026. In accordance with

the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 18, 2026.

On November 9, 2026, the Respondent filed its Response. On November 10, 2026, the Complainant submitted a supplemental filing to the Center and on November 11, 2026, the Respondent submitted its supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on November 11, 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 which operates the following social media platforms - Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp and Messenger. It was formerly known as Facebook Inc. until October 28, 2021, when the Complainant introduced META as its corporate brand, bringing its applications and technologies together under the name Meta Platforms Inc. There was extensive press and social media coverage of the rebranding.

The Complainant has since expanded into artificial intelligence, virtual and mixed reality and wearable technology. Its products include Threads, Edits, Meta Quest devices, Ray-Ban Meta and Oakley Meta AI glasses, META AI and the agentic chatbot, Muse.

The Complainant ranks 17th on Fortune 500 and 16th on Forbes Global 2000 with a market capitalization of approximately USD 1.78 trillion. In a recent YouGov poll, META ranks 7th and FACEBOOK 1st for fame among technology companies.

The META trade mark is registered around the world and includes the following:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 8069945 for META registered on December 16, 2025;
- Chinese Trade Mark Registration No. 58209027 for META registered on February 14, 2025; and
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018686894 for META registered on July 14, 2023.

(individually and collectively, the “Trade Mark”).

The Complainant’s official website is “www.meta.com”. It also owns a portfolio of domain names comprising the Trade Mark including: <metaplatforms.com>, <getmetalive.cn>, <meta.cn>, <metahelp.ai> and <metaplatforms.ai>.

The Complainant has a substantial social media presence. Its Facebook account has more than 106 million followers, X has 9.8 million followers and LinkedIn has more than 12 million followers.
On September 28, 2026, the Complainant announced the launch of “Meta Enterprise Platform”, describing it as the “next major pillar of our business” and a means of helping businesses use AI to grow and transform. It aims to transition Meta beyond a consumer-focused, ad-driven business into an enterprise software and subscription provider. The platform will initially bring businesses and developers tools including the Muse agent, Meta Business Agent, Muse API and Muse Code. The official announcement was covered by TechCrunch and the Financial Times.

The Respondent who is based in China, registered the disputed domain name on September 28, 2026.
The disputed domain name resolves to a GoDaddy parking page. On or about October 20, 2026, the disputed domain name was offered for sale on that page at a “Buy Now” price of USD 250,000. At the date of this Decision, the page states that the disputed domain name is registered but “may still be available”, and includes a “Get this domain” link that takes users to a domain broker service offering to help them buy the disputed domain name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has registered rights in the Trade Mark. It says the Trade Mark has been internationally famous since its launch in 2021, because of its high-profile, widely publicised name change and its well-known social media and communication platforms under the META brand. The disputed domain name incorporates the Trade Mark in full. Adding the terms "for" and "enterprise" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Instead, it heightens the confusion, because the Complainant had just launched its Meta Enterprise Platform.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent was not commonly known by the disputed domain name when it registered it. It has not acquired or applied for a trade mark for "MetaforEnterprise" or any variation of it. It is not a licensee of the Complainant or affiliated with it in any way. The Complainant has not authorised it to use the Trade Mark in a domain name, on a website or otherwise. The Respondent registered a domain name combining the Trade Mark with the words "for Enterprise" on the same day the Complainant launched its Meta Enterprise Platform, so it clearly intended to target the Complainant. The disputed domain name therefore carries a high risk of implied affiliation, which cannot support rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent is not using it for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or for a legitimate non-commercial or fair use. It resolves to a GoDaddy page where it is listed for sale. The value of the disputed domain name comes from the Trade Mark, not from any independent activity or legitimate business of the Respondent.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Trade Mark is inherently distinctive and widely known throughout the world, and the Complainant is a multi-billion-dollar technology company with an extensive global profile. Its reputation has attracted many cybersquatters. Since 2022, the Complainant has filed nearly 100 UDRP proceedings with WIPO involving the Trade Mark. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on the same day the Complainant announced the launch of its Meta Enterprise Platform. That timing is not a coincidence and is a strong indication of targeting. At a minimum, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's rights. Registering a well-known mark together with a descriptive term can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith. The disputed domain name is offered for sale for USD 250,000. That is far more than the Respondent's likely out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. It shows that the Respondent's main purpose was to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or a competitor, within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. The Respondent used a privacy service to frustrate the UDRP proceedings. The disputed domain name also combines the Trade Mark with a term that matches the Complainant's area of activity and natural zone of expansion.

B. Respondent

The Respondent requests that the Panel deny the remedy sought by the Complainant.

The Respondent does not contest the first element. It accepts that the threshold is low where the Complainant's Trade Mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name and it focuses its Response on the second and third elements.

On the second element, the Respondent contends that the Complainant has not discharged its burden of proof. It says the burden does not shift merely because the disputed domain name has not been actively used. According to the Respondent, the disputed domain name is a descriptive combination. "Meta" is an industry-generic term in the metaverse and spatial computing field, and "for enterprise" describes the intended customers. Together, the terms describe a class of services rather than identifying a commercial source. The Respondent notes that a third party used the expression "Meta for Enterprise" in promotional material as early as October 2021. It says it registered the disputed domain name as a descriptive designation for services unrelated to the Complainant. It has never used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant, to pass itself off as an affiliate, or to attract paid clicks. It has made no offer to

transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant or its affiliates, has had no communication with them about a transfer, and has earned no revenue from it. The Respondent undertakes not to use the disputed domain name in any way that suggests a connection with the Complainant. If it puts the disputed domain name to use, it undertakes to display a prominent disclaimer.

The Respondent denies that it registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. It says it registered the disputed domain name for its descriptive value, not to target the Complainant's mark. In its view, awareness of a well-known mark is not bad faith in itself, because the Policy requires an intention directed at the mark. The Respondent acknowledges listing the disputed domain name for sale on the Afternic platform and says it withdrew the listing about 22 days later. The listing was addressed to the platform's users generally, and no sale, payment, offer or communication was directed to the Complainant. It submits that paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy turns on the primary purpose at the time of registration, not on any later intention to sell. A brief listing of this kind is not enough to establish that purpose. The Respondent further submits that there is no pattern of abusive registration; it is not a competitor of the Complainant and did not intend to disrupt the Complainant's business; and apart from the sale listing, the disputed domain name has not been used for any commercial website, advertising or paid-click purpose, or to attract users by creating confusion.

The Respondent distinguishes the decisions relied on by the Complainant. In its view, those cases concerned domain names that directly imitated the complainant's brand and were used for phishing, counterfeit login pages or paid-click links, or long-unused names offered at prices evidently aimed at the trade mark owner. It invites the Panel to decide this case on its own facts.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issues

A. Unsolicited Supplemental Filing

On November 10, 2026, the Complainant filed an unsolicited supplemental filing. It says that contrary to the Response the Afternic sale listing had not been withdrawn 22 days after the registration of the disputed domain name as the sale listing was still active when the Complaint was filed which was 28 days after the registration of the disputed domain name. It also says the evidence submitted that "Meta for Enterprise" is a descriptive industry phrase post-date the Complainant's rebrand and refer to the Complainant. Finally, the Response does not explain why the disputed domain name was registered on the same day the Complainant announced its Meta Enterprise Platform.

On November 11, 2026, the Respondent replied without objecting to the filing. It accepts that the listing was not removed 22 days after the registration of the disputed domain name and says it removed the listing on October 28, 2026.,. It accepts that the evidence submitted refers to the Complainant, and does not dispute the date of registration. However, it maintains that none of this shows that the Respondent targeted the Complainant.

Under paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, unsolicited supplemental filings are generally admitted only where they are relevant and could not have been provided earlier (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.6). The Complainant's filing responds to matters first raised in the Response and relies largely on the Respondent's own Annexes, and the Respondent has had a full opportunity to reply. The Panel therefore admits both filings. The point on timing of the registration of the disputed domain name repeats an argument already made in the Complaint, and the Panel has not treated it as a separate submission. The Panel notes that the Respondent's reply corrects its earlier statement that the sale listing was withdrawn about 22 days after registration. The Panel takes the Parties' concessions into account in its findings below.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English, and the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent agreed and filed its Response in English. As the parties have agreed, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 identity or confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's Trade Mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

While the addition of the terms "for" and "enterprise" after the Trade Mark may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the words do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. The Respondent does not contest this.

Based on the available record, 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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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 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 is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with the Complainant. It has not registered or acquired trade mark rights in the disputed domain name, or made demonstrable preparations to use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent has failed to rebut that case.

The Respondent says it registered the disputed domain name as a descriptive term for enterprise-facing metaverse services. However, it has produced no evidence of any use of the disputed domain name or of demonstrable preparations to use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The only use shown is a sale listing for an exorbitant sum.

The Panel accepts that "meta" can have a descriptive meaning. However, a respondent cannot rely on the descriptive meaning of a term where the domain name is used to trade off a third party's trade mark (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.10.1). The disputed domain name combines the Trade Mark with the words "for enterprise". It was registered on the day the Complainant announced its Meta Enterprise Platform and the word "enterprise" matches the second word of that platform's name. The Respondent has not explained this timing and the Panel notes that the combination of the Complainants' well-known mark with the terms "forenterprise" does not appear to have a common meaning other than to point to the Complainant's service. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name to target the Complainant and its Trade Mark, not for any descriptive meaning. In these circumstances, it carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1).

The imaginate posts that the Respondent relies on as evidence of descriptive use do not assist it. In fact, the Respondent now accepts that they post-date the Complainant's rebrand and refer to the Complainant. The Respondent's undertakings about future use, including a disclaimer, do not give it rights or legitimate interests that it does not otherwise have.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out circumstances, in particular but without limitation, which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its Trade Mark when it registered the disputed domain name and registered it to target the Complainant. The Trade Mark is widely known. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on the same day the Complainant announced its Meta Enterprise Platform, and the disputed domain name combines the Trade Mark with words that closely reflect the name of that platform. The Respondent has offered no credible explanation and evidence for that timing. While timing alone may not always be decisive, it is a relevant factor (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1). Here, the Panel does not accept that it was a coincidence.

Shortly after registration, in this context, the Respondent offered the disputed domain name for sale at USD 250,000The listing was open to the public but in these circumstances, it appears it was intended for the Complainant. The value of the disputed domain name comes from its association with the Complainant, and the Complainant and its competitors are its obvious buyers. This is evidence that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling as set out in paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. In any event, the circumstances in paragraph 4(b) are not exhaustive, and the Panel finds that the registration and use are in bad faith on the record as a whole.

The Panel also notes that the Response said the sale listing had been withdrawn about 22 days after registration. The Respondent has since accepted that it was removed only after the Respondent received notice of the Complaint. This does not help the Respondent's credibility. A respondent cannot cure bad faith registration by changing its conduct once proceedings have begun, and the removal of the listing does nothing to diminish the Respondent's bad faith. In any event, at the date of this Decision, the GoDaddy page to which the disputed domain name resolves states that the disputed domain name is registered but may still be available for purchase. It also invites users to acquire the disputed domain name through a broker service. The disputed domain name therefore remains effectively available for sale.

Further, the Respondent's undertaking to use a disclaimer in future does not cure registration and use in bad faith. In fact, the offer of the disclaimer could be construed as an admission by the Respondent that users may be confused (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.7).

In the circumstances, the Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <metaforenterprise.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/
Karen Fong
Sole Panelist
Date: November 12, 2026