

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Meta Platforms, Inc, Instagram, LLC v. Le Tong
Case No. D2025-1437

1. The Parties

Complainants are Meta Platforms, Inc and Instagram, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

Respondent is Le Tong, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <igsaved.app> and <savefb.pro> (together the "Domain Names") are registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 8, 2025. On April 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On April 9, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy / Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 14, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 17, 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 April 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on May 20, 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

First Complainant, Meta Platforms, Inc, is a United States social technology company, and operates, inter alia, Facebook and Instagram. Founded in 2004, Complainant's Facebook platform (Facebook), commonly referred to as "FB", is a leading provider of online social-media and social-networking services. Since its launch in 2004, Facebook has developed considerable renown and goodwill worldwide. It is also available for mobile devices and currently is the 4th most downloaded mobile application worldwide and the 16th in Viet Nam, as per Data.ai's Top Apps Ranking in 2025.

Second Complainant, Instagram, LLC (Instagram), commonly referred to as "IG", is an online photo and video sharing social-networking application. Since its launch in 2010, Instagram has rapidly acquired and developed considerable goodwill and renown worldwide. Acquired by First Complainant in 2012, today Instagram is one of the world's fastest growing photo- and video-sharing and editing software and online social network, with more than 2.3 billion monthly active accounts worldwide. It has consistently ranked amongst the top "apps" for mobile devices, including for iOS and Android operating systems and has received numerous awards, including "App of the Year" in 2011 from Apple Inc. It is also available for mobile devices and currently is the 2nd most downloaded mobile application in the world, as per Data.ai's Top Apps Ranking in 2025.

Complainants own numerous trademark registrations for FACEBOOK, FB, INSTAGRAM, and IG including:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 008981383, FB (word), filed on March 25, 2010 and registered on August 23, 2011 for services in International Class 45;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4,659,777, FB (word), filed on July 14, 2008 and registered on December 23, 2014 for services in International Class 35;
- Australian Trademark Registration No. 1950863, IG, (word), filed on August 24, 2018 and registered on February 24, 2021 for services in International Class 45; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 017946393, IG, (word), filed on August 23, 2018 and registered on January 31, 2019 for services in International Class 45.

The Domain Name <savefb.pro> was registered on December 18, 2023 and the Domain Name <igsaved.app> was registered on March 2, 2024.

Both Domain Names resolve to websites that prominently display Complainant's FACEBOOK and INSTAGRAM trademarks respectively, display various commercial banners and are similarly structured to one another and purport to offer tools to Internet users to download Facebook and Instagram videos respectively. In particular:

The Domain Name <savefb.pro> resolves to a website (the "FB Website"), which purports to offer a free tool, also available for mobile devices, to download Facebook videos by simply "paste[ing] the Facebook link into the input box on FSaver and click the Download button". In the website it is stated: "With FSaver, you can download any video from Facebook without any hassle. Videos from regular posts, Watch, Reels, Stories, Livestreams, and videos in public or private groups can all be easily downloaded and saved to your device." It does not provide any contact details, apart from an email address ([...].@gmail.com) and a contact form. At the bottom of the home page there is a disclaimer which reads: "We are not affiliated with Facebook or Meta."

The Domain Name <igsaved.app> resolves to a website (the IG Website), which purports to offer a free tool, also available for mobile devices, to download "Instagram videos, photos, stories, IG Reels" by entering an Instagram URL into the box featured on the Website. In the IG Website it is stated that "the tool does not

limit the number of downloads and does not require you to register an account when using it.” It does not provide any contact details, apart from an email address ([...].@gmail.com) and a contact form. At the bottom of the home page there is a disclaimer which reads: “We are not affiliated with Instagram or Meta.” The IG Website also provides a “TikTok Downloader”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Names.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Names:

- (i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Consolidation: Multiple Complainants

The Panel has considered the possible consolidation of the Complaint for the Domain Names. According to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.1, paragraph 10(e) of the Rules grants a panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. At the same time, paragraph 3(c) of the Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain-name holder.

In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation.

The Panel notes the following features of the Domain Names in favor of the consolidation:

- both Complainants are part of the same group of companies, second Complainant being a subsidiary of First Complainant;
- both Complainants have a common grievance against Respondent as the Domain Names target the trademarks of their group of companies; and
- it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation.

The Panel finds that this Complaint consists of multiple Complainants that should, for the reasons discussed above, be permitted to have their Complaints consolidated into a single Complaint for the purpose of the present proceeding under the Policy. Respondent has not objected to the consolidation. The Panel therefore finds that it would be equitable and fair to permit the consolidation.

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 trademark and the Domain Names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

Complainants have 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 each mark is reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the FB and IG marks of Complainant respectively for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the words "saved" and "save", respectively, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".app" and ".pro" are also disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons only (see *Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

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 Domain Names.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent does not provide bona fide services. On the contrary, the Respondent's websites purport to provide unauthorized downloader tools. Furthermore, the IG Website provides also tools for downloading videos of third party platforms, namely Tik Tok. Moreover, the display of commercial banners on the websites indicates that Respondent is using the Domain Names for commercial gain. Such use, including prominent use of the Complainant's trademarks without authorization for the Respondent's commercial benefit, is misleading and does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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 concludes that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Names in bad faith. Complainant's FB and IG trademarks are well-known, as repeatedly recognized (*Instagram, LLC v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Yunus Geyik et al.*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3209](#); *Facebook, Inc. v. Batyi Bela, Whois privacy services, provided by DomainProtect*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2683](#)). Because the FB and IG marks had been widely used and registered at the time of the Domain Names registrations, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainants' marks in mind when registering the Domain Names (*Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1754](#); *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#)). This is also confirmed by the content of the FB and IG Websites, which prominently use Complainants' marks and refer to Complainant's platforms and also by the structure of the Domain Names which entirely incorporate Complainant's trademarks.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Prior UDRP panels have already held in particular that the unauthorized automated downloading of content from social networks amounts to bad faith. In this regard, the circumstances in the case indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Names 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 names <igsaved.app> and <savefb.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: June 3, 2025