

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Instagram, LLC v. Muhammad Asif, Privacy Department, OrangeWebsite.com  
Case No. D2026-0524

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondents are Muhammad Asif, Pakistan, and Privacy Department, OrangeWebsite.com, Iceland.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain name <instaapps.pro> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu, and the disputed domain name <instapro-app.com> is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp. (the “Registrars”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 6, 2026. On February 9 and 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 18, 2026 and March 2, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by emails to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 3, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. On March 9, 2026, the Complainant requested an extension to submit the amended Complaint. On March 9, 2026, the Center extended the deadline for the filing of an amended Complaint to March 13, 2026. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 11, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on April 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on April 16, 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 the Instagram online photo and video sharing social networking platform and application, launched in 2010 and acquired by Meta Platforms, Inc. in 2012. The platform now has more than 3 billion monthly active user accounts worldwide. The official website of the Instagram platform is available at the domain name <instagram.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for INSTA (the "INSTA trademark"), including the following representative registrations:

- the United States trademark INSTA with registration No. 5061916, registered on October 18, 2016 for goods in International Class 9; and
- the European Union trademark INSTA with registration No. 014810535, registered on May 23, 2018 for goods in International Class 9.

The details about the dates of registration of the disputed domain names, their registrars and registrants are included in the table below:

Disputed domain name	Date of registration	Registrar	Registrant
<instaapps.pro>	October 17, 2023	Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu	Muhammad Asif
<instapro-app.com>	July 12, 2025	Internet Domain Service BS Corp	Privacy Department, OrangeWebsite.com

Both disputed domain names are currently blocked by Internet browsers, which display warning messages.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name <instapro-app.com> resolved to a website titled "Insta Pro Download v.14.10 (Official) Latest Version 2026", which promoted and offered for download a modified APK version of the Complainant's Instagram application under the name "Insta Pro APK", which allowed users to download content from Instagram:



At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name <instaapps.pro> redirected to the same website. In February 2026, both disputed domain names resolved to parking webpages, containing pay-per-click (“PPC”) links.

## 5. Parties’ Contentions

### A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its INSTA trademark, as they incorporate the trademark with the addition of the elements “pro” and “app” which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the trademark, which remains clearly recognisable in the disputed domain names.

According to the Complainant, the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, because they are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, are not affiliates or licensees of the Complainant, and are not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers.

The Complainant notes that the Respondents previously used the disputed domain names to attract Internet users to a website that purported to offer for download an unauthorised modified APK version of the Complainant’s Instagram application. This website prominently referenced the INSTAGRAM and INSTA trademarks, displayed the Complainant’s distinctive logo and figurative trademark, and featured a purple colour scheme suggestive of the Complainant’s distinctive branding. The Complainant submits that the offering for download of an unauthorised modified APK version of the Complainant’s Instagram application is likely to place the privacy and security of Instagram users at risk, as content downloaded may be stored and later used by third parties for unauthorised purposes.

The Complainant notes that although the Respondents’ website also included a disclaimer, it was not prominently displayed on the homepage but was only accessible by clicking on the “Disclaimer” tab. The disclaimer read “The content provided on <https://instapro-app.com> is for informational and educational purposes only. We are not affiliated with or endorsed by Instagram or Meta Platforms Inc.” The Complainant maintains that the disclaimer regarding the lack of relationship with the Complainant was not displayed prominently, but even if a prominent disclaimer had been shown on the Respondents’ website, that would not have been sufficient to legitimise their use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It notes that its INSTAGRAM trademark is inherently distinctive and well known globally in connection with its online photo sharing social network, having been continuously and extensively used since its launch in 2010. When the disputed domain name <instaapps.pro> was registered in 2023, the Complainant had amassed over 1.35 billion monthly active users. The Complainant submits that the Respondents must have had knowledge of the Complainant and of its INSTAGRAM and INSTA trademarks when registering the disputed domain names in 2023 and 2025, and their intent to target the Complainant is evident from the content of the website which the disputed domain names were used for, which made explicit reference to the Complainant and offered for download a modified version of its Instagram application. The Complainant submits that the Respondents were thus using the disputed domain names to exploit the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant’s trademarks by creating a false impression of association with the Complainant.

The Complainant further notes that the Respondent Muhammad Asif, was the respondent in the previous UDRP proceedings in *Instagram, LLC v. Muhammad Tahir, Muhammad ASIF, pinoy tvshows*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4981](#), and in *WhatsApp LLC v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Muhammad Asif*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3170](#).

The Complainant notes that in December 2025 its representatives sent abuse notices and cease-and-desist letters to the Respondents, but received no response. Following these communications, the disputed domain names ceased to resolve or redirect to the website promoting the modified APK version of the Complainant's Instagram application, and now point to highly-similar parking webpages featuring PPC links.

## **B. Respondents**

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural issue - Consolidation of Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names are under the control of the same person. It requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

In support of its consolidation request, the Complainant points out that the email address of the registrant of the disputed domain name <instapro-app.com> is associated with the registrant of other domain names whose name and contact details coincide with the name and contact details of the registrant of the disputed domain name <instaapps.pro>. The Complainant submits that the use of the same email address combined with common Pakistani contact details across multiple domain names supports an inference that the same person is also the ultimate beneficial owner of the disputed domain name <instapro-app.com>. The Complainant also notes that at certain points in time the two disputed domain names redirected to an identical website. The Complainant adds that the two disputed domain names follow a highly similar naming pattern, combining the INSTA trademark with the terms "pro" and "app". According to the Complainant, the combination of these factors supports a conclusion that the two disputed domain names are under common control.

The registrants of the disputed domain names did not comment on the Complainant's consolidation request and did not dispute any of its supporting arguments.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states 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 addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

The Panel notes that the two disputed domain names indeed share a similar naming pattern, and the evidence submitted by the Complainant supports its arguments that elements of their contact details partially coincide with the contact details of a third person, and that the two disputed domain names had resolved to an identical website at a certain point in time. In the absence of any denial or contrary evidence, this leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel is not aware of any reason why the consolidation of the disputes in respect of the two disputed domain names would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Therefore, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding. Accordingly, the two Respondents will hereinafter be collectively referred to as "the Respondent".

## **6.2. Substantive Matter**

### **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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the INSTA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the INSTA trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the INSTA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "app", "apps" and "pro") 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 names and the INSTA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 recognised 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.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's INSTA trademark, which was first registered 7 years earlier, and the Complainant's Instagram service has billions of active users worldwide. The disputed domain names combine the INSTA trademark with the terms "app", "apps" and "pro" which suggests a professional version of the Complainant's own application and creates an appearance of an affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The evidence in the case shows that the disputed domain names have been used for a website that featured the Complainant's logo and contained references to its Instagram application, and offered for download a software product named Insta Pro APK, described as "a pro version designed to overcome restrictions and enhance your experience", and "Insta Pro APK is the best Instagram Mod". The website included the header "Insta Pro Download v14.10 (Official) Latest Version 2026" and contained a disclaimer, which was not directly shown, but was only accessible through a "Disclaimer" tab.

In the absence of any denial or contrary evidence, all the above taken together supports a conclusion that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant with the registration and use of the disputed domain names in an attempt to attract Internet users to its website where to offer them to download an application of unknown origin, quality and behaviour, confusing visitors that this application originates from or is endorsed by the Complainant, thus receiving an improper commercial advantage. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Panel therefore 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 content of the website to which the disputed domain names resolved at the time of filing of the Complaint shows that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and its Instagram service when it registered the disputed domain names. As discussed in the section on rights and legitimate interests, the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that the Respondent's intent in registering and using the disputed domain names was to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source or the endorsement by the Complainant of the application offered for download on the Respondent's website.

The above, coupled with the fact that the Respondent has already been found to have acted in bad faith vis-a vis the Complainant or its affiliates in two prior proceedings under the Policy, supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The subsequent use of the disputed domain names for parking webpages with PPC links does not change this conclusion.

The Panel therefore 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 <instaapps.pro> and <instapro-app.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Assen Alexiev/*

**Assen Alexiev**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 23, 2026