

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Vercel Whois, Vercel Inc.
Case No. DME2025-0032

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Vercel Whois, Vercel Inc., United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fbdownloader.me> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 10, 2025. On November 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 12, 2025, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 12, 2025, 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 November 24, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 17, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on December 17, 19 and 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on December 23, 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

The Complainant is a technology company which operates the online platforms Facebook, Instagram, Meta Quest, and WhatsApp. Among them, Facebook, commonly referred to as “FB”, is a provider of social media and social networking services. Founded in 2004, Facebook gained 1 million active users by the end of 2004, 100 million users in August 2008, 500 million users in July 2010, and 1 billion users worldwide by September 2012. As of December 2023, Facebook had approximately 3.07 billion monthly active users and 2.11 billion daily active users on average worldwide. Approximately 85 percent of its daily active users are outside the United States and Canada, and Facebook’s social networking services are provided in more than 70 languages. In 2025, the FACEBOOK brand ranked 19th in Interbrand’s Best Global Brands report. The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for FB and FACEBOOK including the following:

- For the FB mark: United Kingdom Trademark Registration Number UK00003441474 registered on March 20, 2020; and European Union Trademark Registration Number 018146501 registered on November 7, 2020; and
- For the FACEBOOK mark: United States Trademark Registration Number 3,041,791 registered on January 10, 2006; European Union Trademark Registration Number 005585518 registered on May 25, 2011; and International Trademark Registration Number 1075807, registered on July 16, 2010.

The Respondent appears to be using a privacy service, and thus, its identity cannot be determined.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 25, 2024, and redirects to a website in Afrikaans and English at “www.fdownloader.at”, titled “Facebook-aflaaiër” which means “Facebook downloader” in Afrikaans. The website purports to offer tools, referred to as “FDownloader” and “Facebook to MP3” to download content from the Complainant’s Facebook platform, including photos, videos, MP3 audio files, and Reels, by entering a Facebook URL into a field on the Respondent’s website.

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 that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the FB mark in which it has rights since it encompasses the Complainant’s FB mark combined with the term “downloader” which is insufficient to dispel confusing similarity.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to purportedly offer tools for downloading content from the Complainant’s Facebook platform with multiple references to the Complainant’s FACEBOOK trademark. The Complainant contends that such use is not bona fide offering of goods or services as it does not meet the Oki Data Test; specifically, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not actually offering goods and services in relation to the product provided by the Complainant, but offering its own ancillary services, and that the website does not prominently or accurately disclose the Respondent’s lack of relationship with the Complainant, but rather, suggests that the

Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant through the numerous references to the Complainant's Facebook platform and the FACEBOOK mark.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that given the fame and goodwill associated with the Complainant's FB mark, and the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name which is composed of the FB mark and the term "downloader" which is associated with the Complainant's business, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its marks when registering the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to download contents from the Facebook platform without the Complainant's authorization with numerous references to the Complainant's FACEBOOK trademark constitutes use in bad faith. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by exploiting the goodwill and reputation attached to the Complainant's FB trademark and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and services by displaying commercial banners at the website through which the Respondent derived financial gain.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, but the email address on the Whois records for the Respondent sent three identical emails to the Center with the following language:

"Hello, This inbox is not monitored. If you are reporting trademark violations, please submit your report through our abuse form: <https://vercel.com/abuse>. Our team will review your submission and conduct a further investigation. For all other questions, please visit our help page. Thank you, Vercel Support."

It appears that the Respondent is using a privacy service from Vercel Inc. (a web hosting company) and provided the email address of Vercel Inc. instead of its own.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FB mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms – here, "downloader" – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 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 3.0](#), 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.

The Panel further notes that the website to which the disputed domain name redirects, purports to provide tools, unauthorized by the Complainant, that enable Internet users to download content from Facebook platform, which, therefore, cannot be considered as provision of bona fide services. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

And lastly, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation, even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The additional term “downloader” certainly suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, which is reinforced by the numerous mentions of Facebook found on the website to which the disputed domain name redirects. Though the website displays the statement “FDownloader is not a tool of Facebook, and we are not affiliated with Facebook or Meta”, it is at the bottom of the page in small letters with no distinguishing feature highlighting it.

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 the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which is composed of the Complainant’s famous FB mark alongside the term “downloader” – a term associated with the Complainant’s business – and forwards visitors to a page with numerous mentions of the FACEBOOK mark and advertising a program for downloading content from the Facebook platform. This indicates that the Respondent surely knew of the Complainant and the Complainant’s mark and targeted both when registering the disputed domain name.

Further, the Respondent has displayed advertising links to third parties' websites, which is considered as use in bad faith as provided in paragraph 4(a)(iv) of the Policy: "by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted 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."

Specifically, it is very likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name specifically to attract Internet visitors interested in the services of Facebook to its website through the confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

Further, the Respondent's privacy policy discloses that it may at times require users "to provide us with certain personally identifiable information" based on this, the Panel cannot exclude the possibility of use of such personal information for phishing or other unlawful purposes.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <fbdownloader.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: January 6, 2026