

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Instagram, LLC v. visa doc  
Case No. D2026-0638

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Instagram, LLC, United States of America (the “United States” or “US”), internally represented.

The Respondent is visa doc, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <downloadinstagramvideos.com> is registered with One.com A/S (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 13, 2026. On February 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 17, 2026, 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 (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 17, 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 amendment to the Complaint on February 18, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 February 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Leo (Yi) Liu as the sole panelist in this matter on March 20, 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 is a U.S. company which operates Instagram, a world-renowned online photo- and video-sharing social-networking service and mobile application. The application Instagram has more than three billion monthly active accounts worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of a large number of trademarks for Instagram in numerous jurisdictions, including:

- United States Registration No. 4146057 for INSTAGRAM in Class 9, registered on May 22, 2012;
- United States Registration No. 4795634 for INSTAGRAM in Classes 9, 38, 41, 42, 45, registered on August 18, 2015;
- International Registration No. 1129314 for INSTAGRAM in Classes 9, 42, registered on March 15, 2012;
- India Registration No. 2645896 for INSTAGRAM in Class 9, registered on December 19, 2013;
- Pakistan Registration No. 398684 for INSTAGRAM in Class 9, registered on April 23, 2018.

The Complainant and its related entities also own several domain names including <instagram.cn>, <instagram.co.ma>, <instagram.com>, and <instagram.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on July 17, 2025. The disputed domain name does not presently resolve to an active webpage. However, as evidenced by the Complainant's screenshots, the disputed domain name was previously used to download videos posted on Instagram, the content of which is highly relevant to the application Instagram operated by the Complainant.

#### **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 effectively identical to its well-known trademark INSTAGRAM;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 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.

Based on the record submitted, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, "download" and "videos", 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 and the mark 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 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.

As shown by the record, the Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain names or in any other manner. The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence that it has engaged in any use of or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The Respondent's use does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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**

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 the disputed domain name was registered many years after the registration of the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a page involving excessive use of the Complainant's trademark as well as its design trademark, which may create the false impression that the disputed domain name is related to the Complainant's business or is somehow sponsored or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website or service on the Respondent's website or location. Therefore, the registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Since the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website. Such use does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of this case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

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 <downloadinstagramvideos.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Leo (Yi) Liu/*

**Leo (Yi) Liu**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 3, 2026