

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. vinod Sinwar
Case No. D2025-3117

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Instagram, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Perkins Coie, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is vinod Sinwar, India, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <instasave.world> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 5, 2025. On August 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 7, 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, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 8, 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 August 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 13, 2025. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process on September 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 has operated the Instagram online photo- and video-sharing social networking service and mobile application since it was launched in 2010. The Complainant was acquired by Facebook, Inc. (now Meta Platforms, Inc.) in 2012. Today, Instagram has more than two billion monthly active accounts worldwide and is one of the most downloaded mobile applications in the world. The Complainant holds trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States trademark registration number 4146057 for INSTAGRAM, registered on May 22, 2012, with a claim of first use in commerce on October 6, 2010;
- United States trademark registration number 5061916 for INSTA, registered on October 18, 2016, with a claim of first use in commerce on September 20, 2011;
- Indian trademark registration number 2645896 for INSTAGRAM, registered on November 7, 2018;
- Indian trademark registration number 4789526 for INSTA, registered on May 30, 2021; and
- Indian trademark registration number 4016681 for IG, registered on October 16, 2021.

The Complainant also uses the domain name <instagram.com> in connection with its website.

The Respondent is an individual based in India.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 14, 2025. It resolves to a website with a header that reads “InstaSave – Free Instagram Video Downloader | Download Reels, Stories & IGTV”. The website is titled “InstaSave” and offers a tool to “Download Reels from Instagram, Facebook, Tiktok...”. It invites users to copy URLs from Instagram and other social media platforms, paste them into the InstaSave input field, and then download material onto their devices. The video downloader tool is offered without registration and free of charge.

Prior to filing the Complaint, the Complainant sent two cease-and-desist messages to the Respondent via the Registrar’s online “Contact Domain Owner” form.

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 its INSTAGRAM, INSTA and IG marks.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to make any use of its trademarks, including in a domain name, in a mobile application, or otherwise. The Respondent has configured the disputed domain name to resolve to web content that specifically targets the Complainant by offering downloads of content from the Complainant’s platforms, whilst making prominent use of the Complainant’s trademarks. This is likely to confuse Internet users into believing that the Respondent’s “InstaSave” tool is operated by, approved of, sponsored by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The Complainant’s Terms of Use apply to all services

integrated with or related to its platforms and expressly prohibit the Respondent from using the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent knew of the Complainant's rights to its trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name. Given the composition of the disputed domain name, and noting the nature of the Respondent's website, Internet users are likely to believe that the Respondent's website, along with the modified unauthorized "InstaSave" tool promoted therein, are affiliated with, or somehow endorsed by, the Complainant. The website associated with the disputed domain name contains no disclaimer and instead contains language that could mislead and confuse users by also referencing other platforms.

B. Respondent

The Respondent requests that the Panel consider that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in good faith, with no evidence supporting a claim of bad faith registration or use under the UDRP criteria.

The disputed domain name is not used to mislead, impersonate, or create confusion with the Complainant or any other trademark holder. The name "instasave" is used in a descriptive and generic sense, referring to the concept of saving instantly, and is not intended to refer to or leverage the Complainant's brand. Importantly, the disputed domain name has never been used to host, share, or facilitate access to any copyright-infringing content. At no time has it been used to promote, store, or distribute copyrighted material without authorization, nor to enable any form of copyright violation.

The disputed domain name and associated website have not been used to profit from or divert traffic from the Complainant or Meta Platforms, Inc., and there has been no attempt to misrepresent affiliation or endorsement by them.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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. See 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 the INSTA trademark, among others, for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the INSTA mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name as its initial element. Despite the addition of the word "save", the INSTA mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only additional element is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".world") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the INSTA mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that offers a free INSTAGRAM video downloader tool. The website displays the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM mark and gives the false impression that it is associated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. However, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor affiliated with the Complainant in any way. There is no disclaimer on the website of any relationship with the Complainant. The video downloader tool also supports other social media platforms in competition with the Complainant. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Although the video downloader tool is offered free of charge, these circumstances also indicate that this is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the terms of the Policy.

Further, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent’s name is “vinod Sinwar”, which does not resemble the disputed domain name. Apart from the title of the Respondent’s website, there is no evidence that he has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

Turning to the Respondent, he submits that the disputed domain name is not used to create confusion with the Complainant but, rather, that “instasave” is used in a descriptive and generic sense. However, that submission is belied by his website header which states that InstaSave is a “Free Instagram Video Downloader” and lists three types of videos that it can download from the Complainant’s platform (i.e., Reels, Stories and IGTV). The Respondent’s website clearly references the Complainant’s Instagram platform, notwithstanding the fact that it also references other platforms. While the name “InstaSave” adds the descriptive word “save”, the combination is clearly intended to suggest a false association between the Complainant and the tool for saving the Complainant’s content. Accordingly, this is not a descriptive or fair use and the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing.

Based on the record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2025, years after the registration of the Complainant's INSTA mark, including in India, where the Respondent is based. The evidence shows that the INSTA mark has a very strong reputation as an identifier of the Complainant's social media platform. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the INSTA mark with the descriptive word "save", and it resolves to a website offering an INSTAGRAM video downloader tool that clearly references the Complainant's social media platform. The Panel does not accept the Respondent's explanation for his choice of the disputed domain name, for the reasons given in Section 6.B above. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's INSTA mark in mind.

As regards use, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's INSTA mark, which is evidently intended to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website offering an INSTAGRAM video downloader tool and giving the false impression that it is associated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. Contrary to the Respondent's assertion, the composition of the disputed domain name itself and the content of the Respondent's website demonstrate an attempt to misrepresent affiliation with, or endorsement by, the Complainant. Further, the InstaSave tool also supports other platforms that are in competition with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <instasave.world> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2025