

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. Muhammad Noor
Case No. D2026-2320

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Muhammad Noor, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sssinstagram.info> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 29, 2026. On May 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 30, 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 (Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 June 5, 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 June 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 5, 2026. The Center informed the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on July 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Dilek Zeybel as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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, Instagram, LLC, a United States limited liability company, is a global provider of online photo and video-sharing social networking services. Launched in 2010 and acquired by Facebook, Inc. (now Meta Platforms, Inc.) in 2012, the Complainant today has more than three billion monthly active accounts worldwide.

The Complainant's trademark portfolio includes registrations for products and services marketed under the trademark INSTAGRAM. The trademark INSTAGRAM is protected by trademark registrations in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including but not limited to the following:

- United States trademark for INSTAGRAM Registration No. 4146057, registered on May 22, 2012, in class 9;
- International trademark for INSTAGRAM Registration No. 1129314, registered on March 15, 2012, in classes 9, and 42; and
- Pakistan trademark for INSTAGRAM Registration No. 398684, registered on April 23, 2018, in class 9.

The Complainant maintains the official website at <instagram.com> and provides its services through both its website and mobile applications.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 27, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark and a logo similar to that of the Complainant, offering purported "Instagram Downloader" services, and allowing users to download videos and photos from Instagram. On its "About us" subpagesubpage, the website displayed the following disclaimer: "We have no connection or partnership with Instagram". At the time of the Panel's Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website displaying the message "Account Suspended".

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.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier INSTAGRAM trademark registrations. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name incorporates the INSTAGRAM trademark in its entirety, while the addition of the non-distinctive letters "sss" is insufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that the Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant, has never been licensed or otherwise permitted to use the INSTAGRAM trademark, whether in a domain name or otherwise, and has not acquired any trademark rights in the term, here "sssinstagram", or any similar designation.

The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a website prominently featuring the INSTAGRAM trademark, a logo confusingly similar to the Complainant's INSTAGRAM device mark, and stylized design elements closely resembling the Complainant's trade dress while offering purported "Instagram Downloader" services. According to the Complainant, the Respondent thereby created the false impression that the website and its services have been authorized by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant also contends that the website has contained links to third-party services relating to social media platforms other than Instagram, demonstrating that the Respondent sought to exploit the reputation of the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain beyond services relating solely to the Complainant.

The Complainant further submits that the disclaimer appearing on the website does not cure the likelihood of confusion or otherwise establish rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent sought to take unfair advantage of the reputation and goodwill associated with the INSTAGRAM trademark by prominently using the Complainant's trademark together with design elements closely resembling the Complainant's trade dress, thereby reinforcing the misleading impression of an association with the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the services offered thereon.

B. Respondent

Apart from the email communication dated June 5, 2026 asking "what do you mean", the Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules directs the Panel as to the principles to be applied in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

The Policy provides, at paragraph 4(a), that each of the three elements must be made for a complaint to prevail:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, where a party does not comply with any provision of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate.

Considering the Parties' submissions, the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, the Panel's findings with respect to each of the above elements are set out below.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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 here, the letters "sss", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 applicable Top-Level Domain ".info" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded for the purposes of the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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 Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark or to register a domain name incorporating that trademark.

The evidence on record shows that, prior to the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering purported “Instagram Downloader” services while making use of the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM trademark, a logo similar to the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM device mark, and stylized design elements closely resembling the Complainant’s trade dress. Such use falsely suggests an affiliation with, or endorsement by, the Complainant and does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services capable of conferring rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

The website also contained links to downloader services relating to third-party social media platforms, further demonstrating that the Respondent sought to exploit the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademark for commercial gain.

The Panel further finds that the disclaimer appearing on the “About us” section of the website was insufficient to dispel the false impression of affiliation with the Complainant considering the overall circumstances of the case.

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 disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s distinctive and well-known INSTAGRAM trademark. The Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name by coincidence. Rather, the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and deliberately targeted its trademark.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity may by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. The Panel finds this principle applicable in the circumstances of the present case.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was previously used in connection with a website offering purported “Instagram Downloader” services while making use of the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM trademark, a logo similar to the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM device mark, and stylized design elements closely resembling the Complainant’s trade dress. Such use was clearly intended to reinforce the misleading impression that the Respondent’s website was operated, authorized, sponsored, or endorsed by the Complainant. The website also contained links to downloader services relating to third-party social media platforms, demonstrating that the Respondent sought to exploit the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademark for commercial gain.

The Panel therefore 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 INSTAGRAM trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website and the services offered thereon within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the disclaimer appearing on the Respondent’s website does not alter its assessment of bad faith. Where the overall circumstances of a case point to a respondent’s bad faith, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith. In the circumstances of the present case, the overall impression created by the website at the disputed domain name was that it might be affiliated with the Complainant, contrary to the fact. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.7. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <sssinstagram.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dilek Zeybel/

Dilek Zeybel

Sole Panelist

Date: August 3, 2026