

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Instagram, LLC v. Tran Hung

Case No. DIO2025-0039

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Instagram, LLC, United States of America, represented Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondent is Tran Hung, Viet Nam.

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

The disputed domain name <storiesig.io> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 24, 2025. On September 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 25, 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 (Registration Private Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 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 September 30, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or the “.IO Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrew Brown K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on October 31, 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 Instagram, LLC, is an online photo- and video-sharing social networking company. It was launched in 2010. It was acquired by Meta Platforms, Inc (formerly known as Facebook, Inc) in 2012. It is one of the most downloaded applications globally.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the mark IG being an abbreviation of Instagram as follows (“the IG Trademarks”) as well as registrations for the mark INSTAGRAM (“the INSTAGRAM Trademark”).

Mark	No	Country/Territory	Date of Registration	Class
IG	1950863	Australia	August 24, 2018	45
IG	017946393	European Union	January 31, 2019	9, 42, and 45
INSTAGRAM	1129314	International registration	March 15, 2012	9 and 42
INSTAGRAM	4,146,057	United States of America	May 22, 2012	9

The Complainant also holds figurative trademark registrations for a logo showing a color gradation. Details are as follows:

Mark	No	Country/Territory	Date of Registration	Class
	015442502	European Union	September 21, 2016	9,25,35,38,42, and 45
	5,299,116	United States of America	October 3, 2016	9

The disputed domain name was registered on March 26, 2020.

The disputed domain name redirects to a website at “www.storiesdown.co”. This purports to offer a tool referred to as “StoriesDown” for anonymously viewing and downloading content from the Complainant’s Instagram platform.

#### 5. Parties’ Contentions

##### A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that it was recently made aware of the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name – although registration of this took place on March 26, 2020.

In addressing the elements of the Policy, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain name redirects to a website at “www.storiesdown.co” titled “Instagram Viewer”. The landing pages offer a StoriesDown tool for anonymously viewing and downloading content from the Complainant’s Instagram platform. This purports to provide access to content such as stories, reels, videos and photos, without requiring an Instagram account, by prompting Internet users to type “Instagram user names” into the box featured on the landing pages.

Promotional material on the website refers to StoriesDown being the “ultimate tool (online web-based application) that allows you to watch and download Insta stories privately without being traced by the account poster”.

As to the first element, the Complainant contends that it has trademark rights in the IG Trademark in classes 9, 42, and 45. It further claims that its INSTAGRAM Trademark is commonly abbreviated to IG and that online dictionaries confirm this use.

The Complainant asserts that its Instagram application has consistently ranked amongst the top applications for mobile devices including for iOS and Android operating systems. The Complainant refers to widespread reporting of the exponential growth and explosive popularity of its Instagram application since 2010.

The Complainant asserts that the presence of its IG Trademark in the disputed domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and its IG Trademark. The Complainant further states that the addition of the term “stories” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with its IG Trademark because the IG Trademark remains recognizable in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also notes that, while the content of a website associated with a disputed domain name is usually disregarded, previous panels have taken note of the content of a landing page to confirm confusing similarity where it appears prima facie that the Respondent has sought to target the trademark through the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard the Complainant states that:

- (a) The Respondent does not use the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. In this regard the Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent, nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant in any way.
- (b) Previous panels facing cases where service providers are using a domain name containing someone else’s trademark have applied the factors listed in *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), (“*Ok! Data*”). In this case (addressing those factors) the Complainant states that the Respondent is not a bona fide service provider as it does not provide sales or repairs for the proper use of the Complainant’s platform. Further, even if the *Ok! Data* factors were to apply:
  - (i). The Respondent is not a bona fide service provider as it is not providing services for the proper use of the Complainant’s product or services. Rather the Respondent is marketing its own ancillary services in the form of an unauthorized tool.
  - (ii). The Respondent’s landing pages also feature substantial volumes of advertising banners to promote third party promotions, so the Respondent does not use the disputed domain name to sell only trademarked goods or services.
  - (iii). The Respondent’s landing pages do not accurately or prominently disclose the Respondent’s lack of relationship with the Complainant. There is a disclaimer at the end of the website located at the disputed domain name. The Complainant claims that this does not cure illegitimate use of the disputed domain name in circumstances where the landing pages prominently display the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM Trademarks as well as using color schemes very similar to the gradient color scheme on the Complainant’s platform.
- (c) The services offered on the Respondent’s landing pages violate the Complainant’s developer policies applying to Instagram – thus ruling out any rights or legitimate interests.
- (d) The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.
- (e) The Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to exploit the Complainant's goodwill and reputation associated with its IG Trademark by creating a false impression of association with the Complainant. Misleadingly diverting Internet users to the landing pages is asserted not to comprise legitimate noncommercial use or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant says that the Respondent's landing pages feature commercial advertising banners from which it infers that click through revenue is derived by the Respondent. This use is therefore commercially motivated and cannot constitute noncommercial or fair use.

As to the third element of the Policy, the Complainant says that the registration of the disputed domain name was in bad faith because the Complainant's IG Trademark is well-known as an abbreviation of INSTAGRAM. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent intended to target the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name – for the purposes of providing a tool for unauthorized viewing and downloading of content from Instagram.

The Complainant relies on the fact that the Respondent had previously registered another domain name comprising the Complainant's IG Trademark and asserts that this further evidences the Respondent's bad faith intent to target the Complainant (and its IG Trademark): *Instagram, LLC v. Tran Hung*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2025-0023](#) (where the Panel ordered transfer of the disputed domain name <storiesig4k.io>, to the Complainant).

As to use in bad faith, the Complainant relies on the fact that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to purport to offer a tool that enables the viewing and downloading of content from Instagram without authority and to attract Internet users to his site.

The Complainant says too that the Respondent's use of modified versions of its logo and figurative trademark and gradient color scheme seeks to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant. Further, the commercial advertising banners attempt to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion of the Complainant's trademarks.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Preliminary Comments**

#### *.IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy*

The .IO Domain Name Dispute Policy ("Policy" or ".IO Policy") has substantive and procedural similarities to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP") governing generic Top-Level domain names. Accordingly, UDRP decisions are appropriately relevant to this dispute involving the .IO country code Top-Level domain: see *Instagram, LLC v. Imran Khan*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2024-0019](#).

The requirements under the .IO Policy are:

- (i) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) The domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

## *Delay*

The disputed domain name was registered on March 26, 2020 – over five years prior to filing of this Complaint. In the Complaint the Complainant states that it only recently became aware of the disputed domain name.

The issue of delay is one that previous panels have addressed and, in particular, whether delay in bringing a complaint can bar a complainant from filing a case. Previous panels have recognized that mere delay between the registration of a domain name and the filing of the complaint “neither bars a complainant from filing such case, nor from potentially prevailing on the merits”.

The WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.17, states that “Panels have ... noted that trademark owners cannot reasonably be expected to permanently monitor for every instance of potential trademark abuse, nor to instantaneously enforce each such instance they may become aware of, particularly when cybersquatters face almost no (financial or practical) barriers to undertaking (multiple) domain name registrations”.

### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

The Panel further finds that the Complainant’s IG Trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and that the presence of the term “stories” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Previous panels have made comparable findings in <viewerig.com> et al., *Instagram, LLC v. Can Karakoc*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1826](#); <storiesig.net> et al., *Instagram, LLC v. Sebastian Farias, and Stories IG Team*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2032](#); <saveig.io> et al., *Instagram, LLC, Meta Platforms, Inc. v. tan alisa, tecent, Sonia Webster*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2024-0009](#).

The Panel finds that 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 proceedings under the Policy 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 finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered or 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 finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith for the following reasons:

(a) The Complainant has clearly demonstrated its rights to the IG Trademark and that its trademark was well known prior to registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's IG Trademark. A trademark search of this mark or even an Internet search by the Respondent for that trademark would have unquestionably revealed the Complainant and its use of the IG Trademark.

(b) The Respondent's use on the landing page at the disputed domain name of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM Trademark and the Complainant's figurative logo and copies of the Complainant's gradient color scheme all evidence a clear knowledge of the Complainant and evidence the Respondent's intent to target the Complainant's IG Trademark and other trademarks.

(c) It is relevant too to take account of the Respondent's subsequent registration on October 25, 2022, of <storiesig4k.io> in *Instagram, LLC v. Tran Hung*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2025-0023](#). This subsequent domain name has already been found by a previous panel to be registered and used in bad faith. The subsequent registration of a closely similar mark utilizing the Complainant's IG Trademark evidences a course of conduct (starting with the disputed domain name subject to the present Complaint and continuing in 2022 of deliberate targeting of the Complainant's IG Trademark).

The Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons:

(a) The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent is seeking to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's IG Trademark by using it to attract Internet users to the disputed domain name and the landing pages to which the disputed domain name redirects. Internet users encountering the disputed domain name and the landing pages will be misled or confused into believing that the services offered are provided by or licensed by the Complainant when this is not the case. Such users will be reinforced in this erroneous belief by the cumulative effect of the Respondent's heading "Instagram Story Viewer – Watch and Download Insta Stories Anonymously" as well as the adoption and use of the Complainant's logo and figurative trademark and gradient color scheme. Further the actions of prompting Internet users to type "Instagram username" into a box featured on the landing pages will act to reinforce for many Internet users that the disputed domain name and redirected content is licensed or associated. Many Internet users will not notice the disclaimer located at the very end of the landing pages at the bottom of the page.

(b) The Respondent's use is designed to attract commercial revenue through click-through advertising as a result of advertising banners placed on the landing pages to which the disputed domain name redirects.

(c) The Panel is entitled to and does draw and adverse inferences from the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complaint and to the factual allegations made by the Complainant.

The Panel finds 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, <storiesig.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrew Brown K.C./*

**Andrew Brown K.C.**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 14, 2025