

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. Murat Duymaz

Case No. D2026-2450

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Instagram, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Abion GmbH, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Murat Duymaz, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <instatur.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 5, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 9, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same date, 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 June 15, 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 June 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. On July 6, 2026, the Respondent requested an additional four calendar days in which to respond to the Complaint, as per paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. The Center granted the extension on the same day, and the new due date for Response was July 10, 2026. The Respondent did

not submit any response. The Center notified the Parties of commencement of panel appointment process on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 is a limited liability company headquartered in California, United States. It is a provider of a social media platform under the name and trademark INSTAGRAM, directed primarily to photo and video sharing.

The Complainant is the owner of a substantial portfolio of trademark registrations, including for example the following:

- International trademark registration number 1129314 for the word mark INSTAGRAM, registered on March 15, 2012 in International Classes 9 and 42;
- European Union Trade Mark registration number 014810535 for the word mark INSTA, registered on May 23, 2018 in International Class 9;
- Türkiye trademark registration number 2015 95210 for the word mark INSTA, registered on June 27, 2016 in International Class 9; and
- United States trademark registration number 5424416 for a figurative mark as depicted below (the “Camera Logo”), registered on March 13, 2018 in International Class 9



The Complainant operates a website at “www.instagram.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 12, 2020.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a website offering travel and accommodation services in the Cappadocia region of Türkiye. The website is headed with the Camera Logo and the name “instatur”, with the letters “insta” shown in black and the letters “tur” in gold.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that its marks INSTAGRAM and INSTA are globally recognized as designating one of the world’s leading social media platforms. It states that its application was launched in 2010 and rapidly gained popularity, becoming Apple’s iPhone “App of the Year” in 2011. It contends that its app is widely used, in numerous languages, in the United States, Europe, Latin America and other counties including Türkiye, and has over three billion active users worldwide.

The Complainant submits that the marks INSTAGRAM and INSTA have been found by a previous panel under the UDRP to have attained the status of well-known trademarks.¹

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 submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its INSTA trademark. It contends that the disputed domain name incorporates that mark in full, and that the addition of the letters “tur” do not prevent the trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has never authorized it to use its INSTAGRAM, INSTA or Camera Logo trademarks, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent is making neither bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that, on the contrary, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a commercial website, which prominently displays the Complainant’s distinctive trademarks in a manner that suggests an association with the Complainant, and is thereby seeking to capitalize on the Complainant’s goodwill and to attract Internet users under false pretences.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It asserts that, owing to the Respondent’s appropriation of its INSTA and Camera Logo trademarks, it is obvious that that Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name combines its well-known INSTA trademark with the term “tur”, which both means “trip” or “tour” in Turkish, in which case the Respondent is seeking to imply an affiliation with the Complainant’s trademarks in order to promote its website offering travel and related services. The Complainant submits that the term “tur” may also be used to designate Türkiye, in which case the disputed domain name may be assumed by Internet users to represent the Complainant’s official website in Türkiye. The Complainant adds that the Respondent’s website does not include any form of disclaimer making clear that it is not associated with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends in the circumstances that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

¹*Instagram LLC v. Washib Khan, Grynow*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4044](#)

- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark INSTA. The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, together with the letters "tur", which do not prevent the trademark from being 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.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

In the view of the Panel, the Complainant's submissions set out above give rise to a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has failed to file a Response in this proceeding and has not submitted any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name, or evidence of rights or legitimate interests on its part in the disputed domain name, whether in the circumstances contemplated by paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise. The Panel finds, moreover, that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name falsely to imply an association with the Complainant and capitalize on the Complainant's well-known mark for commercial gain, which conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent's part.

Moreover, the Panel finds the disputed domain name to be inherently misleading, since the adoption within the disputed domain name of the Complainant's widely-known INSTA trademark, without any effective distinguishing feature, effectively impersonates, or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by, the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Considering the distinction and reputation of the INSTA mark whose registration and fame predate the registration of the disputed domain name by years, and the composition of the disputed domain name,

coupled with its use as discussed below, the Panel finds that the Respondent most likely had the Complainant and INSTA mark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name.

Further, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for the purpose of a website which prominently features the Complainant's widely known INSTA trademark (albeit amalgamated with the letters "tur", shown in a contrasting colour) and the Camera Logo. There can be no reasonable doubt in the circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks, and that it did so in order to take unfair advantage of those trademarks, by misleading Internet users into believing that both the disputed domain name and its website content were in some manner legitimately affiliated with the Complainant. The Panel accepts both the Complainant's submissions that Internet users are likely to assume that the travel and accommodation services offered by the Respondent are in some way operated or endorsed by the Complainant, and/or that the disputed domain name represents an authorized website of the Complainant in Türkiye.

The Panel finds, in particular, that by using the disputed domain name, 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 trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The Panel therefore finds that the third element under 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 <instatur.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: July 27, 2026