

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram LLC v. Xiangwei Ye
Case No. D2025-2495

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Xiangwei Ye, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <easygetinsta.com> and <easygetinnta.com> (hereinafter referred to as the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (hereinafter referred to as the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 25, 2025. On June 25, 2025, the Center acknowledged receipt of the Complaint and transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On June 25, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 27, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 8, 2025.

The Center verified that the 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 July 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 15, 2025. Pursuant to paragraph 6 of the Rules, on July 31, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Michal Havlík as the sole panellist in this matter on August 11, 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 operates social media platform Instagram (commonly abbreviated as “INSTA” which is a coined term protected by Complainant’s trademarks as well). The platform allows its users to upload media that can be edited with filters, be organized by hashtags, and be associated with a location via geographical tagging. The Complainant operates its business at “www.instagram.com”.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations including:

- United States of America trademark registration No. 5061916, INSTA, with registration date October 18, 2016;
- European Union trademark registration No. 014810535, INSTA, with registration date May 23, 2018;

(hereinafter referred to as the “INSTA trademarks”).

The Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com> was registered on October 30, 2019. Having checked the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com>, the Panel notes that there is no content on the website. Thus, it no longer redirects to the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> as indicated in the Complaint.

The Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> was registered on November 15, 2021. Having checked the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com>, the Panel notes that there is an active website offering a commercial service of procuring Instagram followers and likes for sale as well as a tool for downloading Instagram content.

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 Names.

The Complainant cites its trademarks for word INSTAGRAM and INSTA. The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Names are highly similar to the INSTA trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com> contains the Complainant’s INSTA trademark in its entirety. As for the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com>, it misspells the Complainant’s trademark INSTA by replacing the letter “s” with “n”. The Complainant further contends that both of the Disputed Domain Names are accompanied by the general terms “easy” and “get” followed by the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) “.com” which is an obligatory part of the Disputed Domain Names, therefore, it lacks any distinctive character.

In addition to the above, the Complainant submits that the addition of the terms “easy” and “get” does not prevent both the Disputed Domain Names from finding of being confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark INSTA, see *WhatsApp LLC v. Nayan Borse and Mohd Syazuan Saad, Bix Charity Kb*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3186](#) and WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.8. Similarly, the Complainant submits that the misspelling of the Complainant’s INSTA trademark in the Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, see *Instagram, LLC v. Jonathan Weaver, The Ginn Mill*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0413](#). Moreover, the Complainant alleges that the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> is both visually and phonetically similar to the Complainant’s INSTA trademark, which still remains recognizable in such Disputed Domain Name.

Furthermore, the Complainant submits that the Respondent lacks any rights and legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. The Complainant states that the term “insta” is an invented term which is associated with the Complainant's Instagram platform and thus being inherently distinctive. The Complainant has not given consent for the Respondent to register a domain name that incorporates the Complainant's trademarks.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names show bad faith. With regard to the long-term and broad use of the Complainant's trademarks, the Respondent must have known about their existence when registering both Disputed Domain Names. The Complainant notes that the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> offers for sale Instagram likes and followers for varying prices which cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services. Moreover, the Complainant sent the Respondent a cease-and-desist letter on April 15, 2025, which remained unanswered. In support of its claims, the Complainant cites a few UDRP decisions, among them: *Instagram, LLC v. Whois privacy protection service / Olga Sergeeva / Ivan Ivanov/Privacy Protect, LLC (Privacy Protect.org)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0521](#).

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent email communication to the Center on July 15, 2025, stating that he failed to understand the Complaint. The Respondent has neither submitted any substantive response to the statements and allegations contained in the Complaint nor included any and all bases for the Respondent to retain registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names under Rule 5 (c)(i) of the UDRP Rules that could be taken into consideration by the Panel.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated existence of its valid trademark rights in numerous jurisdictions for the purpose of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Concerning the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com>, the entirety of the Complainant's trademark is reproduced within this Disputed Domain Name. Although the addition of the elements “easy” and “get” 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 Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com> and the Complainant's trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com> is confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

As to the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com>, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark is not contained in the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com>. Nevertheless, the trademark INSTA remains recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name and in conjunction with the holding of the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com> by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> is a modification commonly referred to as 'typo-squatting', as such conduct seeks to wrongfully take advantage of errors by users in typing domain names into their website browser's location bar. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. The addition of the elements “easy” and “get” does not prevent a

finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> and the trademarks for the purposes of the Policy neither. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> is confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

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, previous 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 (even though 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in both Disputed Domain Names since it does not own any registered trademark rights for “insta” or “instagram” nor has he any licence or authorization granted by the Complainant. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant arguments or evidence illustrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com>, and the Respondent has failed to rebut this. The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com>.

The Complainant has provided evidence that the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> is used for a website that offers a commercial service of artificially increasing the number of Instagram “followers”, “likes”, “views”, and “comments”. Such use of the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> is neither a bona fide use nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com>, and the Respondent has failed to rebut this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com>.

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 purpose of paragraph 4(a)(iii), paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

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.

Concerning the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com>, the Panel notes that the INSTA trademarks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> by almost five years and have obtained high degree of distinctiveness. The Respondent therefore knew or should have known about their existence. The Panel acknowledges that the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> was created for commercial profit gained by providing services consisting of offering for sale Instagram likes and followers which considering the composition of such Disputed Domain Name is evidence of bad faith as it shows an intent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. This shows that the Respondent has intentionally exploited the Complainant's reputation and targeted the Complainant with the aim of deceiving Internet users into believing that they were conducting business in association of the Complainant, given that the website placed under the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> makes references to the Complainant by using a very similar colour scheme and offers a tool to download Instagram content. From the above-mentioned, the Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinnta.com> has been registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant provided evidence showing the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com> redirected to the website at <easygetinnta.com>. Panels have found that redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, is evidence that the respondent has registered the domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. The Disputed Domain Name does not currently resolve to an active website. For assessment of absence of bad faith in case of passive holding, the totality of circumstances must be taken into account.

The Panel found the following factors showing lack of good faith of the Respondent

- (i) the Complainant's trademark is highly distinctive;
- (ii) the Respondent failed to provide any evidence whatsoever of any actual or contemplated good faith use;
- (iii) the Respondent had taken steps to conceal their identity;
- (iv) given the composition of the Disputed Domain name, making good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name is implausible.

In the light of the above-mentioned, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name <easygetinsta.com> in bad faith.

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 <easygetinsta.com> and <easygetinnta.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Michal Havlík/

Michal Havlík

Sole Panellist

Date: August 26, 2025