

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. syed saad Burhan
Case No. D2025-3569

1. The Parties

Complainant is Instagram, LLC, United States of America (the “USA”), represented by Perkins Coie, LLP, USA.

Respondent is syed saad Burhan, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iloveinstadownloader.com> 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 September 4, 2025. On September 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 5, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 8, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 12, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on October 17, 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

A. Complainant

Complainant, Instagram, LLC, is a company incorporated in the USA. It operates the globally renowned Instagram photo- and video-sharing social-networking service and mobile application. Since its launch in 2010, Instagram has gained substantial goodwill and worldwide recognition as one of the leading social-media platforms. Acquired by Facebook, Inc. (now Meta Platforms, Inc.) in 2012, Instagram now has over two billion monthly active users worldwide.

Complainant has rights in the INSTA and INSTAGRAM related marks. Complainant is the owner of numerous INSTA and INSTAGRAM trademarks worldwide, including the USA trademark INSTAGRAM registered on May 22, 2012 (the USA Trademark registration number 4146057), the USA trademark INSTA registered on October 18, 2016 (the USA Trademark registration number 5061916), the Indian trademark INSTAGRAM registered on December 19, 2013 (the Indian Trademark registration number 2645896), and the Indian trademark INSTA registered on December 21, 2020 (the Indian Trademark registration number 4789526) (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

B. Respondent

Respondent is syed saad Burhan, Pakistan.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 6, 2024. According to the Complaint and the evidence provided by Complainant, the disputed domain name was previously resolved to a website that targets Complainant by offering tools for downloading content from Complainant's platform, while prominently displaying and exploiting Complainant's trademarks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's INSTA trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the INSTA trademark in its entirety. The addition of the terms "i", "love" and "downloader" is not sufficient to dispel the ensuing confusing similarity between Complainant's INSTA and INSTAGRAM trademarks and the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has 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 Panel finds Complainant's INSTA mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the terms "i", "love" and "downloader" may bear on the 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 and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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 disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

More specifically:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has not provided evidence or reasons to justify the choice of the term "insta", which is the same as Complainant's INSTA trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the INSTA trademark or to register or use any domain name incorporating the INSTA marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on October 6, 2024, after the INSTA mark was registered in the USA (since 2016) and in India

(since 2020). The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's INSTA marks; and

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. By contrast, the disputed domain name resolves to a deceptive website that targets Complainant by offering tools for downloading content from Complainant's platform, while prominently displaying and exploiting Complainant's trademarks. For example, Respondent claims its website is a "Downloader for Instagram", stating: "Welcome to ILoveInstaDownloader.com, the site you always use to download Instagram photos quickly and safely. Our service provides a simple way to download content from Instagram without checking in or disclosing personal information, whether you want to save videos, photographs, Reels, or Stories" (Annex 10 to the Complaint).

Based on the available record, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent has registered and used the disputed 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.

Based on the information provided by Complainant, the Panel finds that Complainant has a reputation in the INSTA and INSTAGRAM marks with regard to its products and services. It is not conceivable that Respondent would not have had Complainant's trademark in mind at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name (in 2024). This has been reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's INSTA trademark entirely, and that the associated website makes prominent use of the mark while offering tools to download content from Complainant's platform.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name to operate a website that directly targets Complainant by offering such download tools, prominently displaying and exploiting Complainant's trademarks to attract users. The Panel therefore concludes that Respondent is using a confusingly similar disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 disputed domain name <iloveinstadownloader.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/

Yijun Tian

Sole Panelist

Date: November 13, 2025