

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. Saurabh Motwani, Hexashield Ltd.
Case No. D2026-0459

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Saurabh Motwani, Hexashield Ltd., Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <stealthgram.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 5, 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 February 9, 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 February 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 9, 2026. The Center sent an email regarding possible settlement on the same day, and the Complainant did not request a suspension. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on March 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 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 operates a world-renowned online photo-sharing and video-sharing social networking application (“Instagram”), launched in 2010. Acquired by Facebook, Inc. in 2012, Instagram is a large and growing social network, with more than 3 billion monthly active accounts worldwide. Instagram has consistently ranked amongst the top apps for mobile devices, including for iOS and Android operating systems. Instagram is currently the most downloaded app worldwide, according to some major newspapers.

The Complainant owns numerous registrations in many jurisdictions for the word trademark INSTAGRAM, including International Registration No. 1129314 (registered on March 15, 2012), United States Trademark Registration No. 4146057 (registered on May 22, 2012), and European Union Trade Mark No. 14493886 (registered on December 24, 2015). The Complainant also owns the following registrations for the word trademark GRAM: Benelux Trade Mark No. 992903 (registered on March 31, 2016); and Hong Kong, China, Trade Mark No. 304385160AB (registered on May 21, 2019).

The disputed domain name has a creation date of February 11, 2023. The Complainant has provided screenshots, dated October 21, 2025, of the website to which the disputed domain name then resolved. The website was titled “stealthGram”, with the subtitle “Discover Instagram Without Limits – Start Now”. The website purported to offer a tool to view and download Instagram content, including stories, posts, highlights and reels, by entering an Instagram URL into the box on the website. It stated, among other things, that “stealthGram focuses on enhancing the overall experience for its users by providing features that are not available directly on the official Instagram app”. The website also featured commercial advertising and full-page pop-up advertising. At the bottom of the homepage was the following disclaimer-like wording: “stealthGram is not affiliated with, endorsed, or sponsored by Instagram or any of its affiliates. All rights reserved by their respective owners.”

On October 2, 2025, in an attempt to resolve the matter amicably, the Complainant’s lawyers sent a cease and desist letter in relation to the disputed domain name. The Complainant’s lawyers did not receive any response.

As at the date of the filing of the Complaint and at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active location.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights, on the following grounds. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for INSTAGRAM and GRAM in various jurisdictions. The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant’s GRAM trademark and an abbreviation of its INSTAGRAM trademark, preceded by the term “stealth”, under the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, which may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity, as it is a standard requirement of registration. Prior panels have found that domain names comprising the Complainant’s GRAM trademark are confusingly similar to its GRAM and its INSTAGRAM trademarks. The addition of the term “stealth” to the Complainant’s GRAM trademark and to

an abbreviation of its INSTAGRAM trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between those trademarks and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the following grounds, among others. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its GRAM or INSTAGRAM trademarks, in a domain name or otherwise. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence of the Respondent having acquired or applied for any trademark registrations for “stealthgram”, “gram” or any variation thereof. Until on or around October 21, 2025, the Respondent’s website purported to offer a tool to view and download content from the Complainant’s Instagram platform. The Respondent’s website also featured commercial banner advertising and full-page pop-up advertising, from which the Complainant infers that the Respondent derived commercial gain. Prior UDRP panels have found that the use of a domain name to purport to offer tools to view and download content from the Complainant’s Instagram platform does not constitute a legitimate or fair use of such domain names. The Respondent cannot be viewed as a bona fide service provider as it does not provide sales or repairs in relation to a product provided by the Complainant. Rather, the Respondent has made unauthorized use of the Complainant’s GRAM and INSTAGRAM trademarks to market its own ancillary services, namely purporting to offer a tool to enable Internet users to view and download content from the Complainant’s Instagram platform. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to exploit the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM and GRAM trademarks by creating a false impression of association with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith on the following grounds, among others. The Complainant’s INSTAGRAM trademark is inherently distinctive and well known throughout the world in connection with its online photo sharing social network, having been continuously and extensively used since its launch in 2010. Similarly, the Complainant’s GRAM trademark is well-known as an abbreviation of the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM trademark. In light of the above, the Complainant submits that the Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of Instagram or its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name in February 2023. The Respondent, having no authorization to make use of the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM or GRAM trademarks, registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s prior rights and with a view to pointing the disputed domain name to a website that purported to provide a tool for the unauthorized downloading of Instagram content, in bad faith. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to purport to offer a tool that enabled Internet users to view and download Instagram content and relied on the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM and GRAM trademarks to attract Internet users to its website. The Respondent’s intent to derive commercial gain from its unauthorized use of the Complainant’s trademarks in the disputed domain name and on the Respondent’s website is clear from the Respondent’s use of its website to feature commercial banner advertising and full-page pop-up banner advertising.

B. Respondent

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

The Respondent did, however, send an email to the Center on February 9, 2026 stating (among other things) that he did not wish to contest the Complaint and that he consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

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 disputed 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. It is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for the word trademark INSTAGRAM and the word trademark GRAM.

The entirety of the Complainant's GRAM trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, preceded by the word "stealth". As stated in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8: "Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements." The Complainant's GRAM trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the addition of the word "stealth" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

Furthermore, an abbreviation of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, preceded by the word "stealth". Given the very significant renown of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark established through very substantial use, and the absence of any argument from the Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is willing to find that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark.

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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its INSTAGRAM or GRAM trademarks. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The evidence establishes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website which, by reproducing the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark and by purporting to offer tools to view and download content from the Complainant's Instagram platform, falsely purports to be affiliated with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name to imply a commercial affiliation that does not exist can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

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. 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 disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the present case, the Panel notes that: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant first used and registered its INSTAGRAM and GRAM word trademarks; (ii) the disputed domain name incorporates an abbreviation of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark and the entirety of the Complainant's GRAM trademark, and merely adds the word "stealth"; and (iii) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that contains the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark. It is clear the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. While there was a disclaimer of association with the Complainant at the bottom of the Respondent's website, in the overall circumstances of this case that disclaimer could not have the effect of alleviating the confusion caused by the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 name <stealthgram.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2026