

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. Muhammad Noor

Case No. D2026-3055

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Muhammad Noor, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ssinstagram.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 July 10, 2026. On July 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 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 July 18, 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 July 20, 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 July 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 18, 2026, and July 28, 2026. In its acknowledgement of July 28, 2026, the Center stated that, absent confirmation or a further communication by the Response due date, it would regard the Respondent's July 28 communication as the Response. No further communication was received, and on August 20, 2026, the Center advised the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Alexandre Nappey as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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 service and application, launched in 2010, and acquired by Facebook, Inc. (now Meta Platforms, Inc.) in 2012.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for INSTAGRAM in numerous jurisdictions. The record includes, among others:

- United States trademark registration No. 4146057 for INSTAGRAM, registered on May 22, 2012, with a claimed first-use date of October 6, 2010, and
- Pakistan trademark registration No. 398684 for INSTAGRAM, registered on April 23, 2018.

The Registrar's registration data records that the disputed domain name was created on October 7, 2025.

The Complaint states that the disputed domain name was registered on October 6, 2025. Nothing in this case turns on that one-day difference. In either event, registration of the disputed domain name occurred many years after registration and use of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM mark.

The record contains screenshots taken on July 8, 2026, showing that the disputed domain name resolved to an English-language website headed "Download Instagram Video" and "Free online video downloader". The website offered a tool for downloading photos, videos, reels, and stories from public Instagram profiles. It repeatedly used the name "sssinstagram" and displayed a logo in a purple, pink, and orange gradient. The website stated that the service was "Free Forever" and that the project was supported by "lightweight ads". Several screen-lengths below the top of the home page, under the heading "Independent platform", the website stated: "sssinstagram is not affiliated with Instagram or Meta". A separate "About" page also stated that the service was not affiliated with Instagram or its parent company, Meta Platforms. The same page described the service as maintaining an ad-supported environment. The website provided [...]@sssinstagram.info as its contact address.

Following disclosure of his identity on July 18, 2026, the Respondent sent two emails to the Center. It referred to a Google search for other "SSS Instagram" domain names and wrote: "My domain is running almost from 9 months. You were sleeping" and "My traffic is suddenly down due to domain removal. Who is responsible?" It then stated: "This is only downloader site. Not affiliates or subsidiaries with Instagram", adding that the claim was "fake" and that it had purchased the disputed domain name.

On July 28, 2026, the Center's standard commencement notice explained that USD 1,000 of the filing fee would be refunded to the Complainant if the Parties settled. The Respondent replied: "Return payment above 2000 [USD] to me. Not 1000 [USD]" and "you Pay only 1000 [USD] as I m register person and has traffic".

Shortly afterward, the Respondent sent the fuller communication summarized below as its Response.

In its amendment of July 20, 2026, the Complainant also identified WIPO Case No. [D2026-2320](#), involving the same Parties and the domain name <sssinstagram.info> ("*Instagram, LLC v. Muhammad Noor*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2320](#)").

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.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known INSTAGRAM mark because it contains that mark in its entirety, preceded only by the letters "ss", and followed by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".info".

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not licensed or otherwise authorized to use the INSTAGRAM mark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has no corresponding trademark registration. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name and the website's presentation create a misleading impression of affiliation and do not amount to a bona fide offering or fair use. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent cannot satisfy the principles stated in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

Third, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. It relies in particular on the notoriety of the INSTAGRAM mark; the Respondent's evident knowledge of that mark; the domain name's composition; the website's downloader service, branding, and references to Instagram; and the use of the website to attract Internet users for commercial gain. The Complainant further relies on WIPO Case No. [D2026-2320](#) and submits that the Respondent's separate registration and use of domain names confusingly similar to the INSTAGRAM mark establish a pattern of bad faith conduct. The Complainant also alleges that such downloader services may enable malware, phishing, data harvesting, or other unlawful activity, and relies on unsuccessful enforcement notices and the use of a privacy service.

B. Respondent

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

In its various email communications, the Respondent denies registration or use in bad faith. In its first reactions of July 18, 2026, it stated that the website was only a downloader, was not affiliated with Instagram, had operated for almost nine months, and had lost traffic. The Respondent also pointed to other "SSS Instagram" websites found through Google.

In its July 28 communication, it states that the website was created solely as a functional tool enabling users to download publicly accessible Instagram content and was not intended to impersonate Instagram or to mislead visitors. It states that it never claimed affiliation, partnership, sponsorship, or endorsement by Instagram and points to other websites whose domain names contain the word "Instagram" for similar utility services. In its view, that word was used descriptively to indicate compatibility with the INSTAGRAM platform. The Respondent asks the Panel to consider its asserted good-faith intention, the site's actual use, and the absence of any intention to mislead.

In its separate July 28 email, the Respondent requested a payment "above 2000 USD", rather than USD 1,000, referring to its status as the registrant and to the site's traffic.

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary issue: Respondent's Informal Communications

The Respondent's communications of July 18 and 28, 2026 do not comply with all of the formal requirements for a Response under paragraph 5 of the Rules. Under paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, however, the Panel determines the admissibility, relevance, materiality, and weight of the evidence.

The Center expressly advised that it would regard the July 28 communication as the final Response if the Respondent submitted nothing further by the due date.

In the interests of fairness, the Panel admits and has considered all of the Respondent's communications. Their informal and largely unsupported nature affects their evidentiary weight but does not prevent their consideration. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.2.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities that: (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; 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

The disputed domain name incorporates the INSTAGRAM mark in its entirety, preceded by the letters "ss". The mark remains plainly recognizable. The addition of these letters, whether understood as meaningless or otherwise, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8. The gTLD ".info" is disregarded as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Panels reached the same conclusion regarding the closely comparable domain names <sssinstagram.tools> and <sssinstagram.net>. See *Instagram, LLC v. Fahad Nawaz, ZeeTv*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1630](#); and *Instagram, LLC v. Abir Mahmud*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0589](#).

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 non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. Where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent; the overall burden of proof remains with the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. It has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its INSTAGRAM mark. Nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the trademark search submitted by the Complainant discloses no corresponding right of the Respondent.

The Respondent relies on the asserted descriptive purpose of identifying a service compatible with Instagram. The Panel accepts that the site offered, or at least purported to offer, a downloader relating to Instagram. That fact alone does not confer a right or a legitimate interest. The composition of the disputed domain name combines the Complainant's coined and distinctive mark with only the letters "ss", which do not describe the Respondent's service or distinguish it from the Complainant. The resulting domain name carries a material risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The overall presentation reinforces rather than dispels that risk. The website repeatedly used the INSTAGRAM mark, styled its own name as “sssinstagram”, adopted a purple, pink, and orange gradient similar to the visual identity associated with Instagram, and focused on content from the Complainant’s platform. The site was also commercial: it expressly stated that it was supported by advertising. On these facts, the use is neither a legitimate noncommercial use nor a fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers within paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

The Panel has taken account of the disclaimer. It is a relevant fact, but it does not establish a right or legitimate interest here. On the home page it appeared only after several screen-lengths of content, below the downloader interface and the repeated branding. It therefore did not clearly and prominently distinguish the site from the Complainant at the point of a visitor’s initial encounter with the disputed domain name and the upper portion of the site. Nor does the separate disclaimer on the “About” page cure that initial impression. A disclaimer may support legitimacy where the overall use is otherwise bona fide, and the relationship is clearly disclosed; it cannot by itself cure a use that otherwise takes unfair advantage of likely confusion. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.2 and 3.7.

The *Oki Data* criteria concern certain resellers, distributors, and service providers and do not directly determine the status of this unaffiliated downloader service. Even if those criteria were applied by analogy, the Respondent would not prevail because the disputed domain name and the site’s initial presentation did not accurately and prominently disclose the lack of a relationship with the trademark owner. See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#); [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1.

The Respondent’s observation that third parties operate other domain names containing the INSTAGRAM mark does not establish his own rights or legitimate interests. The conclusion above is also consistent with decisions concerning Instagram-related downloader sites, including *Instagram, LLC v. Fahad Nawaz, ZeeTv*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1630](#); *Instagram, LLC v. Sabir Gurmani*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3339](#); and *Instagram, LLC v. Nerijus Abrutis*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2047](#).

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances evidencing registration and use in bad faith. Under paragraph 4(b)(iv), bad faith exists where a 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 source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website or of a product or service on it.

The evidence establishes that the Respondent knew of and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its INSTAGRAM mark when registering the disputed domain name. The mark is distinctive and had been registered and used for many years. More decisively, the Respondent incorporated it in the disputed domain name and built a website devoted to downloading Instagram content, repeatedly referring to Instagram and using similar gradient branding. The Respondent’s own explanation confirms that he selected the mark to identify compatibility with the Instagram platform. This is therefore not a case of coincidence.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent used the disputed domain name intentionally to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to affiliation or endorsement. The website was designed to draw users seeking an Instagram-related service and expressly stated that advertising supported it. The combination of the disputed domain name, the Instagram-specific service, and the site’s branding was apt to create an initial impression of association with the Complainant. The Respondent’s denial of an intention to mislead does not outweigh these objective circumstances. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1 and 3.1.4.

For the reasons already given, the disclaimers do not change that conclusion. They were not sufficiently prominent to prevent the initial confusion created by the disputed domain name and the upper portion of the website, and they do not cure the Respondent's intentional commercial targeting. In the circumstances, the disclaimers also confirm the Respondent's awareness that visitors might otherwise perceive an affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.7.

The Complainant's submission concerning a pattern of conduct is also supported by the record. In *Instagram, LLC v. Muhammad Noor*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2320](#), the same Respondent was found to have registered and used <sssinstagram.info> in bad faith for a materially similar Instagram downloader website, and transfer was ordered. That domain name was registered on August 27, 2025, followed by the present disputed domain name approximately six weeks later. The prior decision itself was issued only on August 3, 2026, and therefore did not place the Respondent on notice when he registered the disputed domain name. The relevant point is instead that the two separate registrations represent two instances of trademark-abusive conduct directed at the same brand owner. As few as two such instances may establish a pattern of bad-faith conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2. The Panel finds that this history reinforces the conclusion of deliberate targeting and bad faith in the present case. In view of the clear application of paragraph 4(b)(iv), the Panel need not determine whether every element of paragraph 4(b)(ii) is independently established.

The Panel has also considered the Respondent's July 28 payment message. Statements made in the context of settlement may be considered where they illuminate the parties' motivations, but they are not necessarily indicative of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.10. Here, the wording followed the Center's explanation that USD 1,000 would be refunded to the Complainant upon settlement. Read in context, the Respondent appears to have requested payment exceeding USD 2,000, rather than USD 1,000, by reference to his status as registrant and the site's traffic. This provides some corroboration that the Respondent attributed commercial value to the disputed domain name and its traffic. Nevertheless, because the wording is imprecise and does not expressly make transfer of the disputed domain name conditional on payment, the Panel gives it limited weight and does not treat it as sufficient, by itself, to establish that the disputed domain name was registered primarily for sale under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

This conclusion is consistent with decisions finding bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) where respondents used Instagram-formative domain names for unaffiliated content-downloading services. See *Instagram, LLC v. Fahad Nawaz, ZeeTv*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1630](#); *Instagram, LLC v. Sabir Gurmani*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3339](#); and *Instagram, LLC v. Nerijus Abrutis*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2047](#).

The Panel finds the third element of 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 <sssinstagram.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alexandre Nappey/

Alexandre Nappey

Sole Panelist

Date: August 31, 2026