

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. i love you
Case No. D2026-3536

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is i love you, Afghanistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <reset-password-instagram.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 10, 2026. On August 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 12, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 12, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 14, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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 United States company established in 2010 that operates a well-known social media network under the trademark INSTAGRAM (the “INSTAGRAM Mark”), that specialises in online photo and video sharing. The Complainant’s Instagram product was launched in 2010 and has more than 3 billion monthly active accounts. Its Instagram app is among the most downloaded apps worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of a trademark registration in the United States (and other jurisdictions) for the INSTAGRAM Mark (No. 4,146,057 registered on May 22, 2012, for downloadable computer software in class 9).

The Domain Name was registered on April 26, 2026. The Domain Name is presently inactive but prior to the commencement of the proceeding resolved to a website (the “Respondent’s Website”) that prominently reproduces the INSTAGRAM Mark and the Complainant’s logo (or at least a strikingly similar logo). The Respondent’s Website prompts visitors familiar with the Complainant’s social media network to “reset their password” which involves users entering in their current Instagram password, hence providing the Respondent with their password which could be used to allow the Respondent to access any accounts visitors hold with the Complainant and commit fraud.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends:

- (i) that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM Mark as it consists of the INSTAGRAM Mark in its entirety with the addition of the descriptive terms “reset-password-”;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights nor any legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name, nor has it conducted a legitimate business under the Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the INSTAGRAM Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name, nor does it use the Domain Name for a bona fide purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather the Respondent is using the Domain Name to pass off as the Complainant for commercial gain as part of a phishing scheme to illicitly gain access to Instagram account details of visitors. Such use is not a legitimate use of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the Domain Name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent’s Website as part of a phishing scheme. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "reset-password-" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.
- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.
- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.4.

- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent's use of the Domain Name to resolve to a webpage reproducing the Complainant's INSTAGRAM Mark and related logo, purporting to allow visitors to "reset your password" to their account, does not amount to use for a bona fide offering of goods and services. Rather, it appears that the purpose behind the Respondent's Website is to encourage visitors, under the impression that they are dealing with the Complainant, to provide their Instagram password to the Respondent to enable the Respondent to commit some sort of fraud. Such conduct is phishing, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its web site or other online 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 web site or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here being phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent's Website reproduces the Complainant's INSTAGRAM Mark and related logo and purports to provide visitors, under the impression that they are dealing with an official website of the Complainant, with the opportunity to reset their passwords. However, what apparently occurs is that the Respondent uses the Respondent's Website to steal the passwords of visitors misled into visiting the Respondent's Website for the purposes of logging into their accounts with the Complainant. Such conduct is deceptive, and in previous UDRP decisions has been found to be evidence of registration and use in bad faith, see *FIL Limited v. Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Mark Steven*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3284](#).

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Name <reset-password-instagram.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2026