

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Haixu Qin  
Case No. DAI2025-0047

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Meta Platforms, Inc., United States (“U.S.”), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

Respondent is Haixu Qin, U.S.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <metasuperintelligence.ai> and <metasuperintelligencelabs.ai> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 18, 2025. On September 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On September 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names, 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 Complainant on September 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 26, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 27, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on October 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Christopher S. Gibson as the sole panelist in this matter on November 10, 2025. 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

Complainant is a U.S. social technology company that operates Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest (formerly Oculus), and WhatsApp. Complainant's focus is to bring the "metaverse" to life and to help people connect, find communities, and grow businesses. Complainant launched its Meta brand October 28, 2021.

Founded in 2004, Complainant's Facebook platform is a leading provider of online social-media and social-networking services. People use Facebook to stay connected with friends and family, to discover what is going on in the world, and to share and express what matters to them. Today, Facebook has approximately 3.07 billion monthly active users and 2.11 billion daily active users on average worldwide (as of May 8, 2025). Facebook is also available for mobile devices and in recent years has consistently ranked amongst the top "apps" in the market. In 2024, the Facebook brand ranked 21<sup>st</sup> in Interbrand's Best Global Brands report.

In June 2025, Complainant launched a new artificial intelligence ("AI") superintelligence project called Meta Superintelligence Labs, also known as MSL. The project's stated purpose is to consolidate Meta's core AI teams under one roof and to develop personal superintelligence for everyone. Complainant's creation of Meta Superintelligence Labs was reported as early as June 10, 2025, by The New York Times (in an article titled "Meta Is Creating A New A.I. Lab To Pursue Superintelligence"). As reported in an article by CNBC titled "Mark Zuckerberg announces creation of Meta Superintelligence Labs. Read the memo", Complainant issued an internal memorandum on June 30, 2025, announcing the new MSL initiative and the team that would lead it. On that same date, Complainant published a public letter titled "Personal Superintelligence" explaining Meta's superintelligence vision.

Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for META in a number of countries, including the following:

- META, Andorran Trademark Registration No. 43626, registered on January 3, 2022;
- META, Monaco Trademark Registration No. 2200039, registered on February 8, 2022; and
- META, European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018686894, registered on July 14, 2023.

Complainant has also made substantial investments to develop a strong presence online by being active on various social-media platforms. For instance, Complainant's official page on Facebook has over 91 million "likes". In addition, Complainant has 13.5 million followers on X (formerly Twitter). These pages are available at the following URLs:

"<https://www.facebook.com/Meta>"  
"<https://www.instagram.com/Meta>"  
"<https://x.com/Meta>"  
"<https://www.youtube.com/Meta>"

Given the online nature of Complainant's social-networking business, Complainant's domain names consisting of its various trademarks are at the center of its business and the main way for millions of users to avail themselves of its services. Reflecting its global reach, Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names consisting of or including its META trademark, registered under various generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") as well as under a number of country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs").

Complainant states it was recently made aware of the Domain Names, which were registered on July 6, 2025, comprising Complainant's META trademark together with the term "superintelligence" and, in the case

of the Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelabs.ai>, the additional term “labs”, both under the ccTLD “.ai”. The Domain Names resolve to Registrar parking pages that features PPC links, including links to “Artificial Intelligence Site” and “Image Generative Ai”. On July 24, 2025, Complainant's lawyers submitted notices via the Registrar's registrant contact form in relation to both Domain Names but did not receive a response.

Respondent registered the Domain Names on July 6, 2025. The Domain Names resolve to Registrar parking pages that feature PPC links, some of which relate to AI.

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

#### **(i) Identical or confusingly similar**

Complainant owns trademark registrations for META in various countries as noted above. Complainant submits it has established trademark rights in META for the purposes of the Policy.

Complainant claims that the presence of its META trademark in the Domain Names is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between them and Complainant's META trademark. Complainant contends the addition of the term “superintelligence” in the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with Complainant's META trademark, which remains clearly recognizable in the Domain Names. Similarly, Complainant asserts the addition of the term “labs” in the case of the Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelabs.ai> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with Complainant's META trademark, which remains recognizable in the Domain Name.

Complainant states the ccTLD “.ai” may be disregarded for purposes of assessing confusing similarity, as it is viewed as a standard registration requirement.

Complainant concludes the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's META trademark, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

#### **(ii) Rights or legitimate interests**

Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Complainant asserts Respondent is unable to invoke any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy that would demonstrate rights or legitimate interests.

Complainant claims Respondent is not using the Domain Names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent is not a licensee of Complainant, nor affiliated with Complainant in any way. Complainant has not granted any authorization for Respondent to make use of its META trademark in a domain name or otherwise. There is no evidence of Respondent having made demonstrable preparations to use the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, such as evidence of business formation-related due diligence/legal advice/correspondence, evidence of credible investment in website development or promotional materials such as advertising, letterhead, or business cards, or proof of a genuine (i.e., not pretextual) business plan utilizing the Domain Names or other evidence generally pointing to a lack of indicia of cybersquatting intent. Instead, the Domain Names resolve to Registrar parking pages that feature PPC links, most of which relate to AI. Complainant states prior UDRP panels have found that such pointing does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Complainant maintains that in light of the nature of the Domain Names, which comprise Complainant's META trademark followed by the additional term “superintelligence” and, in the case of the Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelabs.ai>, followed by the additional term “labs”, as well as the timing of the registration of the Domain Names – being six days after Complainant's Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative was publicized – Complainant infers that Respondent registered the Domain Names to target Complainant and its

Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative. Complainant further submits Respondent is seeking to attract Internet users to its websites, due to a perceived association between the Domain Names and Complainant, to obtain click-through revenue thereby capitalizing on the reputation and goodwill enjoyed by Complainant and its META trademark.

Complainant also states there is no evidence to suggest Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Names. Respondent registered Domain Names using a proxy service. The identity of the underlying registrant has been disclosed as an individual whose name bears no resemblance to the Domain Names. Respondent's use of the Domain Names to resolve to Registrar parking pages featuring PPC links, most of which relate to AI, does not give rise to any legitimate claim of being commonly known by the Domain Names, nor does it give rise to any reputation in the Domain Names themselves, independent of Complainant's trademark rights. To the best of Complainant's knowledge, there is no evidence of Respondent having acquired or applied for any trademark registrations for "meta" or any variation thereof, as reflected in the Domain Names.

Finally, Complainant contends Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names. The Domain Names resolve to Registrar parking pages that feature PPC links. Prior UDRP panels have found that such use of the Domain Names does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Complainant submits a core factor in assessing whether a respondent's use of a domain name is fair is whether it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. Prior panels have found that where a domain name consists of a trademark together with an additional term, such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. In the present case, the Domain Names comprise Complainant's META trademark, followed by the term "superintelligence" and, in the case of the Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelabs.ai>, the additional term "labs", both under the ccTLD ".ai". As detailed above, Respondent registered the Domain Names six days after Complainant's Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative was publicized. Given the nature of the Domain Names and the timing of their registration, Complainant contends they carry a risk of implied affiliation with Complainant, which does not support a claim of fair use.

For the foregoing reasons, Complainant concludes that it has established a prima facie showing that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Accordingly, the burden of production shifts to Respondent to come forward with evidence to rebut Complainant's case. In the absence of such evidence, Complainant may be deemed to have satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(iii) Registered and used in bad faith

Complainant contends that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as well as for reasons that go beyond the non-exhaustive list of circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

Complainant states that since the re-naming of Complainant's company as "Meta Platforms, Inc.," Complainant's META trademark has become well known throughout the world and associated with Complainant's goods and services. Complainant's re-naming attracted significant international media attention, while Complainant's services are used by billions of monthly active users across the globe. Prior UDRP panels have repeatedly recognized the strength and renown of Complainant's META trademark and ordered the transfer of disputed domain names containing the META trademark to Complainant.

Moreover, the Domain Names comprise Complainant's META trademark, followed by the term "superintelligence" and, in the case of the Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelabs.ai>, followed by the additional term "labs", both under the ccTLD ".ai". The terms "superintelligence" and "labs" may be read as a reference to Complainant's Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative, Complainant's creation of which was reported in an article dated June 30, 2025, i.e., less than a week before Respondent registered the Domain Names on July 6, 2025. In light of the similarity between the Domain Names and Complainant's META

trademark, and the timing of the registration of the Domain Names, Complainant contends Respondent could not reasonably argue it did not have knowledge of Complainant and its rights in the META trademark at the time of registration of the Domain Names. Complainant maintains Respondent registered the Domain Names with no authorization to make use of Complainant's trademark, knowing that the Domain Names would carry a risk of implied affiliation with Complainant, in bad faith.

Complainant further asserts that Respondent's failure to respond to the notices submitted by Complainant's lawyers via the Registrar's registrant contact form is further evidence of Respondent's bad faith, as is Respondent's use of a proxy service to register the Domain Names.

Regarding use in bad faith, the Domain Names resolve to Registrar parking pages that feature PPC links, including links to "Artificial Intelligence Site" and "Image Generative AI", which target Complainant's AI area of business. In light of the nature of the Domain Names, which comprise Complainant's META trademark followed by the additional term "superintelligence" and, in the case of the Domain Name <metasuperintelligenceai>, the additional term "labs", the Domain Names create a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. As a result, unsuspecting Internet users are likely to be mistakenly directed to webpages at the Domain Names, which feature PPC links from which Respondent likely derives click through revenue. Complainant submits that by using the Domain Names in this manner, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the sites at the Domain Names, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those web pages and the products and services advertised therein, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In view of the above, Complainant concludes the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

### **(i) Identical or confusingly similar**

Respondent maintains that Complainant lacked trademark rights at the time of registration of the Domain Names. In particular, Respondent states that at the time they were registered, Complainant did not possess any registered trademark rights in the following names, "Meta Superintelligence Labs," "Meta Superintelligence," "Met A Superintelligence Labs," and "Met A Superintelligence," all of which are very different from the term "meta," which is a common term.

Respondent contends that, in accordance with WIPO Overview of Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.1.3, trademark "rights must be in existence at the time the complaint is filed", and Complainant cannot rely on unregistered or unsubstantiated marks to establish rights. Respondent states Complainant's only basis for rights appears to be press announcements about "Meta Superintelligence Labs." Respondent claims such announcements do not, by themselves, establish common law trademark rights – especially without demonstrated consumer recognition, use in commerce, or secondary meaning. Moreover, Respondent states that not everyone across the world reads The New York Times or CNBC regularly, the news outlets referenced by Complainant. Further, there was not much press presence at ".ai" (Anguilla), either. Additionally, Respondent states there is no service or product provided by Complainant's Meta Superintelligence Labs to the public, even months after the purchase of the Domain Names.

Respondent states that his business is about "Met A Superintelligence Labs". The terms "meta", "met", "a", "superintelligence", and "AI" are all generic and descriptive words commonly used in the technology and AI sectors. Domain names composed of such generic terms cannot reasonably be said to be confusingly similar to any single party's mark. Moreover, "met" is a distinct and standalone English word, unrelated to "meta." The phrase "Met A" reads as two distinct common words. And "Met A Superintelligence" differs phonetically and semantically from "Meta Superintelligence."

Respondent states the Domain Names use the “.ai” ccTLD (Anguilla), not “.com” or “.us” and therefore refer to a separate field. Complainant’s business is founded in Delaware and does not operate in Anguilla. Further, if Complainant thinks the Domain Names are related to its business, it could have easily bought them before making its announcement, but it did not.

Respondent concludes that because Complainant had no valid trademark rights, no service published, and Complainant’s brand does not use “.ai”, and because the Domain Names are composed of common, descriptive words that are different from Complainant’s brand, the Domain Names are not identical or confusingly similar to any trademark to which Complainant has rights.

(ii) Rights or legitimate interests

Respondent states that before any notice of dispute, he registered the Domain Names for his own AI-related startup project, tentatively called “Met A Superintelligence.” Respondent states he also added another term, “labs”, to protect his brand. Respondent contends this aligns with a bona fide registration and use of the Domain Names. Respondent claims his business plan and draft codebase and email evidence predate Complainant’s announcement by several months. Respondent states he could provide documentation (e.g., emails from venture capital firms, preliminary business plans, and AI model drafts) to evidence preparations for bona fide use. Whereas some information is not provided due to business privacy concerns, Respondent claims he could provide this information to the Center separately, if the Center requested it. Respondent concludes, citing [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 2.2, that evidence of demonstrable preparations to use the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services is sufficient to establish legitimate interest for his business and the Domain Names.

Further, Respondent states the Domain Names have never been used to sell, advertise, or mislead consumers, nor have they been listed for sale anywhere. The websites are inactive – blank by default, which is now an inactive holding page generated automatically by the Registrar after the Registrar locked it – and contain no content that showed any affiliation with Complainant or its subsidiaries. Respondent claims this constitutes legitimate noncommercial use under Policy.

Respondent asserts that because “meta”, “met”, “a”, “superintelligence”, and “AI” are generic terms, any entrepreneur has a legitimate right to use them for domain names for independent, descriptive purposes.

In conclusion, Respondent registered the Domain Names independently, for a bona fide business use, well before any notice of a dispute, and has never attempted to mislead users. The Domain Names were never listed for sale. Therefore, Respondent possesses legitimate interests in them.

(iii) Registered and used in bad faith

Respondent states the Domain Names were never offered for sale, nor were they listed for sale on a website. Respondent states he has ignored emails that inquired about the Domain Names, which Complainant mentioned in its submission. Respondent contends this shows that the Domain Names were not registered primarily for the purpose of selling to Complainant and, therefore, Complainant has failed to prove bad faith under the Policy.

In addition, Respondent states he has not engaged in another pattern of registering domain names corresponding to Complainant’s trademark. These were isolated registrations related to Respondent’s own AI project. Respondent is not a competitor to Complainant at the moment. Respondent’s AI project is under development and not launched yet. Additionally, Respondent does not follow any press on social media mentioned by Complainant, such as The New York Times or CNBC. Respondent states he rarely uses social media. Respondent points out that Complainant could not provide any evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s announcements. According to Respondent, Complainant mentioned that the first press mention of MSL by The New York Times was on June 10, 2025, while the Domain Names were purchased on July 6, 2025. Respondent claims that if he bought the Domain Names for profit, he would have bought them on June 11, 2025, not a month later.

Moreover, Respondent states there was no trademark related to the Domain Names at the time of their registrations. After registration, no content was listed on their websites. The Domain Names were never listed for sale, and there was no response to emails that asked about them. The Domain Names have remained inactive – blank by default, now an inactive holding page automatically done by the Registrar after the Complaint was submitted – and were never used before the Complaint, thus ruling out any bad faith use. In addition, mere passive holding, by context, does not mean bad faith, especially where the Domain Names contain generic words and Respondent provided a plausible and legitimate business explanation. Lastly, Respondent states that the content on the Domain Names is produced by the Registrar, not the Respondent.

(iv) Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”)

Respondent contends that due to Complainant’s lack of trademark rights, and the clear evidence of Respondent’s bona fide purpose and legitimate preparatory business use, the Complaint should constitute RDNH. The Domain Names were registered and held in good faith, without any evidence to profit from, disrupt, or conflict with Complainant’s brand. There is no evidence of bad faith registration or use. Therefore, Respondent submits that the Panel should deny the Complaint, and if applicable, consider a finding of RDNH, as the Complaint appears to have been filed in the absence of any trademark rights and in disregard of the facts.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed on its Complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. Those elements are as follows:

- (i) the Domain Names registered by Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and
- (iii) Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Names 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 Complainant’s META trademark and the Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Here, Complainant has shown rights in its META trademark for the purposes of the Policy. Moreover, the Panel finds the META mark is recognizable within the Domain Names, particularly as it appears in the dominant first position in the phrases that comprise each of the Domain Names. The addition of the terms “superintelligence” and “labs” in the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. As stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8, “[w]here the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements.” See *Meta Platforms, Inc. v Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Valdo Rojs*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2327](#) (<metapresale.click> et al.):

Each of the Domain Names incorporates the META Mark with the addition of other terms (and a TLD, which can be discounted as an essential element of any domain name). Other UDRP panels have repeatedly held that where the relevant trade mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

See also *Silhouette Lift S.L., Sinclair Pharmaceuticals Ltd and Sinclair Is Pharma PLC v. Falah Hasan Ali, Super Silhouette Soft Ltd / Ali Mahmood, Ali M. Mahmood*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1027](#) (<silhouette-soft.com> and <super-silhouette-soft.com>); *Bumble Holding Limited v. Susan Foxx, Crescendo Homes*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0652](#) (<bumblelabs.site>); *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0158418577, Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0158418577 / Daniel Garcia, Government Logistics LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1918](#) (<accenture-labs.com>).

Accordingly, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, Complainant must prove that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. A complainant is normally required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, 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 do so, a complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Here, the Panel finds that Complainant has made out a strong prima facie case, while Respondent has not adequately rebutted that case. Complainant has submitted that:

(i) Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant;

(ii) Complainant has not granted Respondent any authorization to use Complainant's META trademark in the Domain Names;

(iii) there is no evidence to suggest Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Names, as Respondent registered the Domain Names using a proxy service and is an individual whose name bears no resemblance to them;

(iv) Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names, because at the time of the Complaint, they resolved to parking pages featuring PPC links, some of which relate to AI (i.e., Complainant's area of business), and the composition of the Domain Names themselves cannot constitute fair use because they effectively impersonate or suggest sponsorship or endorsement by Complainant; and

(v) Respondent is not using the Domain Names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, as there is no evidence of Respondent having made demonstrable preparations to use them for such an offering.

Complainant's main contention is that, in light of the nature of the Domain Names, which comprise Complainant's META trademark followed by the additional term "superintelligence" and, in the case of the Domain Name <metasuperintelligencelabs.ai>, followed by the additional term "labs", as well as the timing of their registration – being six days after Complainant's Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative was publicized – Respondent registered them to target Complainant and its Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative, thereby seeking to attract Internet users to Respondent's websites, due to a perceived association between the Domain Names and Complainant, to obtain click-through revenue by capitalizing on the reputation and goodwill enjoyed by Complainant and its META trademark.

Respondent does not contest items (i), (ii) and (iii) above. However, Respondent claims as to item (iv) that because the Domain Names were never offered for sale or used to advertise or mislead consumers and were inactive, this constitutes legitimate noncommercial fair use under Policy. The Panel disagrees. Respondent has not adequately addressed the evidence that the Domain Names resolved to PPC webpages with links to services potentially competitive with Complainant's AI services. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9 ("panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links

does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users.”); see also *Meta Platforms, Inc., Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC v. Suresh Nair*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2747](#) (<metaquestfoundation.com>):

“The evidence indicates that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with PPC links. As such, it cannot be found that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.”

Moreover, regarding Respondent's argument that the words “meta,” “met,” “a,” “superintelligence,” and “AI” are generic terms that may be used for independent, descriptive purposes, the Panel finds that here, the composition of the Domain Names effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by Complainant, because the Domain Names prominently display Complainant's META mark in the first position, followed by words that describe Complainant's Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1; see also *Facebook, Inc. v. kadir eren, software*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3335](#) (<facebookverifiedbadge.com>). Further, the Panel finds that given the circumstances in this case, Respondent's alleged passive holding does not amount to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names.

Regarding item (v), this is Respondent's main contention – that, before any notice of dispute, he registered the Domain Names for his own AI-related startup project, called “Met A Superintelligence”. However, Respondent has provided absolutely no explanation for why he chose this name for his project, and no evidence of any kind to demonstrate the existence of the project. The purported evidence that Respondent supplied in the annexes to his Response does not provide any intelligible support. Respondent has referenced business privacy concerns; however, the Panel is not satisfied with this explanation. Under the Rules, paragraph 10(d), the Panel has the power to “determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence”. In the Panel's view, Respondent's reference to a startup project is vague and unsupported. Given the absence of any substantiating details and the close timing between the registration of the Domain Names on July 6, 2025, and Complainant's announcements concerning its Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative in June 2025, the Panel finds that Respondent's contentions are not credible.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that Complainant demonstrate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1, states “bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark”.

For the reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel considers that Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the Domain Names. The Panel finds, on the balance of the probabilities, that Respondent was likely aware of Complainant and its META trademark and targeted that mark when registering the Domain Names. The Domain Names were registered within a month of reporting on Complainant's Meta Superintelligence Labs initiative. While Respondent notes that it does not follow any press and that not everyone in the world reads news outlets such as the New York Times or CNBC regularly, the Panel notes that, according to the contact details provided by Respondent to the Registrar for registration of the Domain Names, both Parties are located in the U.S. Additionally, as discussed in the preceding heading, Respondent contends that he registered the Domain Names in relation to his own AI-related startup project, which would theoretically corroborate his selection of the “.ai” ccTLD for the Domain Names. However, as the Panel previously noted, Respondent's evidence on this contention is vague and unsupported, and an alternate inference could be drawn that Respondent's choice of ccTLD in combination with the composition of the Domain Names relates to the AI services advertised by Complainant and thus indicates targeting or knowledge of Complainant and its mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections

2.14.1 and 3.2.1. In the Panel's view, given this timing and Respondent's lack of substantiating evidence for why it chose the Domain Names, this should not be viewed as a coincidence. Rather, the timing is indicative of Respondent's abusive and wrongfully opportunistic behavior. See e.g., *Meta Platforms, Inc. v. libin, Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4222](#) (<metaverified.asia>):

"The Panel also notes that the timing of the registrations, which coincided with the Complainant's public announcement of its 'Meta Verified' service, is a circumstance that, in connection with the Respondent's efforts to sell, supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names."

Further, the Domain Names have resolved to PPC webpages with listings to AI links potentially competitive with Complainant's services. Even if the webpages (and links therein) are automatically generated by the Registrar and not the Respondent, as he contends, prior panels have held that "a respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for content appearing on the website associated with its domain name" and "[n]either the fact that such links are generated by a third party such as a registrar...nor the fact that the respondent itself may not have directly profited, would by itself prevent a finding of bad faith." [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5. The Panel finds that, considering the totality of the circumstances, by using the Domain Names in this manner, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the sites at the Domain Names, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those webpages and the products and services advertised therein, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See *Meta Platforms, Inc., Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC v. Suresh Nair*, supra:

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a parking page displaying PPC links is a clear indication that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of this website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, and in view of all of the above circumstances, the Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

#### **D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

Because Complainant has satisfied the three elements required under the Policy, the Panel finds no support for Respondent's allegation of RDNH.

#### **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 Domain Names, <metasuperintelligence.ai> and <metasuperintelligenceai.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

*/Christopher S. Gibson/*

**Christopher S. Gibson**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 1, 2025