

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. Amir shahzad

Case No. D2026-3913

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Amir shahzad, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <instaapros.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 1, 2026. On September 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 11, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 11, 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 amended Complaint on September 16, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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 Instagram (also commonly referred to as “Insta”), one of the world’s leading photo and video-sharing social network services with around 3 billion monthly active users worldwide in 2025.

Instagram was launched in 2010 and was acquired by Facebook, Inc. (now Meta Platforms, Inc.) in 2012.

The Complainant is, among others, the owner of the following trademarks:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 014810535 for the word mark INSTA registered on May 23, 2018;

- United States Trademark Registration No. 4146057 for the word mark INSTAGRAM registered on May 22, 2012; and

- United States Trademark Registration No. 5424416 for a figurative mark, consisting of a rounded edge square with a circle in the center of square and a dot in the upper right-hand corner above circle (“Instagram camera logo”) registered on March 13, 2018.

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names incorporating its INSTAGRAM and INSTA marks; e.g. <instagram.com> registered on June 4, 2004, and <instaprohub.com> registered on November 10, 2024.

The disputed domain name, which was registered on May 12, 2026, has been used to resolve to a website extensively displaying the Complainant’s marks and offering for download an application branded as “Insta Pro”, described by the Respondent as a modified version of the Complainant’s official Instagram app.

The “About Us” page accessible via the “Contact Us” section of the website at the disputed domain name states among others that “Insta Pro (<https://instaapros.com/>) is an independent informational website. We are not affiliated with, endorsed by, or officially connected to Meta Platforms, Inc., Instagram, or any of their subsidiaries”.

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, among others, contends that:

- the disputed domain name which comprises its INSTA mark followed by the letter “a” and the term “pros” is confusingly similar to its mark;

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it is unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy;

- the global renown of the Complainant's marks and the nature of the Respondent's website demonstrate actual knowledge and targeting of the Complainant and its marks; and
- the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to offer unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's app and the nature of the Respondent website is evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed with the complaint, namely that:

- (i) the 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the 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 or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the INSTA mark is reproduced and 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 here the letter "a" and the term "pros" 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.

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 Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor has ever been authorized by the Complainant to make any use of its marks, in a domain name or otherwise. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has been making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

As mentioned above, the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that prominently and extensively features the Complainant's INSTAGRAM and INSTA marks and a close variation of its signature "Instagram camera logo" and promotes unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's official Instagram app. Such use could create an impression of association or affiliation with the Complainant and does not constitute a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's website has not been promoting genuine, authorized goods and the above-mentioned disclaimer employed by the Respondent is not prominently visible and accessible. Hence the "nominative (fair) use" justification for a domain name reflecting the Complainants' mark does not apply in this case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1; *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The Panel finds that 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 due to the global reach and popularity of the Complainant's Instagram app, the INSTAGRAM and INSTA marks have become well-known before the registration of the disputed domain name (see e.g. *Instagram, LLC v. Washib Khan, Grynow*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4044](#) and *Instagram, LLC v. Fahad Nawaz, ZeeTv*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0449](#)).

UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Respondent replicated the well-known INSTA mark in the disputed domain name and the website at the disputed domain name prominently features the Complainant's INSTAGRAM and INSTA marks and a close variation of its signature "Instagram camera logo". This, in view of the Panel, demonstrates that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its marks at the time of registration and has registered the disputed domain name in order to target the Complainant and its well-known marks.

The website at the disputed domain name promotes for download an unauthorized modified version of the Complainant's app, which in the totality of these facts and circumstances is evidence of the Respondent's intent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website, or of

a product or service on such website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <instaapros.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2026