

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. All India Group
Case No. D2026-3471

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is All India Group, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <instareeldownload.net> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 5, 2026. On August 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 5, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 26, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On the same day, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center, identifying itself as the registrant and requesting a copy of the Complaint and details of the Complainant. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 31, 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 September 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any

formal Response. On September 28, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi as the sole panelist in this matter on October 1, 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 company with its principal place of business in California, United States, providing photo- and video-sharing social networking through its application software named “Instagram” launched in 2010. The Complainant has rapidly grown in the market of the above businesses with over 3 billion monthly active accounts globally.

The Complainant launched on August 5, 2020, a new feature called “Instagram Reels”, enabling users to create and discover short, entertaining videos on Instagram. Instagram Reels has become one of the Complainant’s most successful features.

The Complainant has secured ownership of many registrations for INSTA, INSTAGRAM and REELS in many jurisdictions, such as:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 5061916 for INSTA, registered on October 18, 2016;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 014810535 for INSTA, registered on May 23, 2018;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1129314 for INSTAGRAM, registered on March 15, 2012;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4146057 for INSTAGRAM, registered on May 22, 2012;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 014493886 for INSTAGRAM, registered on December 24, 2015; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 018242386 for REELS, registered on September 14, 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 11, 2026. It resolves to a website titled “Insta Reel Download” that purports to offer a tool to download Instagram content, including photos and videos, from the Complainant’s Instagram platform. The website features the following remarks in small font in the website footer: “Disclaimer: We are not connected with Instagram™ or Meta Platforms, Inc. All content belongs to its respective owners. Please respect copyright laws”.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant’s contentions. On August 26, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center stating: “Please note that I am the actual Registrant/Owner of this domain (Respondent), and I have NOT filed any complaint. It appears your notice mistakenly addressed me as the “Complainant”. Kindly provide me with: 1.A copy of the formal Complaint filed against my domain. 2.Details of who the Complainant is (the party filing the case) and the date of filing. Please send all case documents to this email address so I can prepare and submit my formal Response.” No formal Response was received.

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant's contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (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 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name includes the entirety of the INSTA trademark owned by the Complainant. It also includes the term "reel" which is a main part of the Complainant's REELS trademark with the letter "s" missing. The additional term "download" which may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks for the purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. In addition, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), ".net" in the disputed domain name is to be disregarded in determining the first element as the latter is a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Taken together, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, 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 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 Complainant has been doing business in the photo- and video-sharing social networking market under its INSTAGRAM trademark since 2012 and since 2015 at the latest under its INSTA trademark. It launched in 2020 a new feature called "Instagram Reels", enabling users to create and discover short, entertaining videos on Instagram, and has been doing this business under its REELS trademark since 2021 at the latest.

The Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks, given the longstanding reputation of both the Complainant and the trademarks. The Respondent's aim in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users to an online location for potential gain by taking unfair advantage of and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

With regard to the requirement that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, the Panel notes that, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a website titled "Insta Reel Download" that purports to offer a tool to download Instagram content, including photos and videos, from the Complainant's Instagram platform. In addition, the term "download" in the disputed domain name, which is closely related to the Complainant's business on Internet, also suggests the bad faith of the Respondent.

Incidentally, the Panel notes that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves contain the remarks as follows: "Disclaimer: we are not connected with Instagram™ or Meta Platforms, Inc. All content belongs to its respective owners." In cases where the respondent appears to otherwise have a right or legitimate interest in a disputed domain name, a clear and sufficiently prominent disclaimer may lend support to circumstances suggesting its good faith. However, in this case, these remarks are in small font in the website footer and the overall circumstances point to the Respondent's bad faith. In such cases, panels have held that the respondent's use of a disclaimer as an admission by the respondent that users may be confused. The mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.7.

Accordingly, 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 <instareeldownload.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/

Masato Dogauchi

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2026