

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Instagram, LLC v. ROlf Berwers, Transsupply
Case No. DCO2026-0022

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is ROlf Berwers, Transsupply, Bulgaria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <instalikeusa.co> 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 March 11, 2026. On March 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 12, 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 March 17, 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 paragraphs 2 and 4 of the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 25, 2026. In accordance with paragraph 5 of the Rules, the due date for Response was April 14, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on March 18, 2026. However, the Respondent did not file any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on April 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuji Yamaguchi as the sole panelist in this matter on April 24, 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 paragraph 7 of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, commonly known as “Insta”, launched in 2010 and acquired by Facebook, Inc. (now Meta Platforms, Inc.) in 2012, is an online photo and video sharing social-networking service provider with over 3 billion monthly active accounts worldwide today.

The Complainant has secured ownership of numerous trademark registrations for INSTA and INSTAGRAM in many jurisdictions throughout the world, including but not limited to European Union Trade Mark No. 014810535 for INSTA (registered on May 23, 2018), United Kingdom Trade Mark No. UK00003570393 for INSTA (registered on January 13, 2023), International Registration No. 1129314 for INSTAGRAM (registered on March 15, 2012), United States Trademark Registration No. 4,146,057 for INSTAGRAM (registered on May 22, 2012) and European Union Trade Mark No. 014493886 for INSTAGRAM (registered on December 24, 2015).

The Complainant is the registrant of numerous domain names consisting of or including its INSTAGRAM trademark under a wide range of generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”) as well as under numerous country code Top-Level Domains (“ccTLDs”), such as <instagram.com> which resolves to the Complainant’s official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 30, 2024, and resolves to the Respondent’s website titled “INSTALIKESUSA” that purports to offer for sale, inter alia, Instagram followers, likes and video views, makes prominent reference to the Complainant and displays graphics that are similar to the Complainant’s logo and figurative trademark. Whilst the Respondent’s website primarily purports to offer for sale followers, likes and video views on the Complainant’s platform, it also purports to offer for sale followers, likes and views on other online platforms, including TikTok, X (formerly Twitter) and YouTube. The Respondent’s website does not feature any clearly-worded disclaimer or disclaimer-like statement to clarify its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

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’s contentions may be summarized as follows:

The presence of its INSTA trademark in the disputed domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s INSTA trademark. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is also confusingly similar to the Complainant’s INSTAGRAM trademark, as the disputed domain name comprises “insta”, a well-known abbreviation of the INSTAGRAM trademark. The addition of the term “like usa” to its INSTA trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between its INSTA trademark, which remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its INSTA or INSTAGRAM trademarks in a domain name or otherwise. Since (i) the Respondent is

not providing sales or repairs in relation to a product provided by the Complainant; (ii) The Respondent does not exclusively offer services exclusively in relation to the Instagram platform; and (iii) There is no disclaimer on the Respondent's website to clarify its lack of relationship with the Complainant, the Respondent has failed to comply with the first, second and third criteria set out in *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). As a result, Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the services offered via the Respondent's website are endorsed or otherwise approved by the Complainant. The services offered via the Respondent's website interfere with the intended operation of the Complainant's service in violation of the Instagram Terms of Use and also violate the Meta Developer Policies. Moreover, given the prices charged and the quantity of followers, likes and video views offered for sale by the Respondent, it is clear that the services offered via the Respondent's website are inauthentic.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name using a proxy service. There is no comprehensive information on the Respondent's website regarding the Respondent's identity. The identity of the underlying registrant has been disclosed as "ROlf Berwers [sic]", which does not bear any resemblance to the disputed domain name whatsoever. There is no evidence of the Respondent having acquired or applied for any trademark registrations for "Insta", "Instalikeusa" or any variation thereof, as reflected in the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not support any reasonable claim of being commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor does it give rise to any reputation in the disputed domain name itself, independent of the Complainant's trademark rights. The Respondent is not currently making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers.

The Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark is inherently distinctive and well known throughout the world in connection with its online photo sharing social network, having been continuously and extensively used since its launch in 2010. Similarly, the Complainant's INSTA trademark is well known throughout the world as an abbreviation of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM trademark. The Respondent's intent to target the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name may be inferred from the content of the Respondent's website, which makes explicit reference to the Complainant's INSTA and INSTAGRAM trademarks. The Respondent is making unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark, seeking to increase traffic to its website, to obtain commercial gain derived from the goodwill and reputation attached to the Complainant's mark, in bad faith. Not only is the Respondent seeking to unduly profit from the Complainant's reputation and goodwill, but also the services offered via the Respondent's website have the effect of destroying the authenticity of the user experience provided by the Complainant's social network, thereby damaging the Complainant's reputation. Furthermore, the Respondent's activities likely involve the creation of fake accounts, which is also clearly illegitimate and therefore constitutes an additional indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

The Respondent has been involved in a previous case filed by the Complainant in which the panel found the Respondent's bad faith. See *Instagram, LLC v. Rolf Berwers, Namik Hondzo, Rolf Rolf*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3261](#).

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on March 18, 2026, confirming receipt of the Complaint. However, the Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must show the following three elements to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name:

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

(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 in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the INSTA trademark for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See section 1.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant's INSTA trademark in its entirety, followed by the term "like usa" (without space), under the ccTLD ".co".

As stated in section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Since the INSTA trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the addition of the term "like usa" (without space) do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the INSTA trademark for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See *Instagram, LLC v. Gamal Eldin Mohamed Reda, Mobile9*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2025-0019](#) (<instadownloader.co>); and *Instagram, LLC v. Rolf Berwers, Namik Hondzo, Rolf Rolf, supra* (<instalikesusa.com>, <instalikesusa.net>, and <instalikeusa.com>).

The ccTLD ".co" may be disregarded for purpose of assessing confusing similarity, as it is viewed as a standard requirement of registration. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's INSTA trademark and the first element in paragraph 4(a) 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.

As the Complainant asserts, there is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired or applied for any trademark registrations for "Insta", "Instalikeusa" or any variation thereof, as reflected in the disputed domain name. Although the Respondent's website to which the disputed domain name resolves displays the sign "INSTALIKESUSA" (which adds the letter "s" between "like" and "usa"), there is no evidence showing that the Respondent is commonly known by "INSTALIKESUSA" or the disputed domain name, as contemplated by paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its INSTA or INSTAGRAM trademarks in a domain name or otherwise. The Respondent's services to sell followers, likes and video views of Instagram and other social platforms may be fraudulent. See *Instagram, LLC v. Rahman Shaikh*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1247](#) (<instafollows.org>). Thus, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. See *Instagram, LLC v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Yan Jiang and Whois Domain Admin / Li Dan*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2092](#) (<인스타그램고수.com> (xn--299ak61b7lao3nqon.com) and <instagosu.com>).

Although the overall burden of proof in the proceedings is on the complainant, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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 in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

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.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Considering that INSTA is a well-known abbreviation of the INSTAGRAM trademark and that the Respondent's website purports to offer for sale Instagram followers, likes and video views, the Panel finds that the Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM and INSTA trademarks at the registration of the disputed domain name.

By providing the services to sell followers, likes and video views of Instagram and other social platforms, the Respondent intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and the services offered therein, in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See *Instagram, LLC v. Rolf Berwers, Namik Hondzo, Rolf Rolf, supra* (<instalikesusa.com>, <instalikesusa.net>, and <instalikeusa.com>); and *Instagram, LLC v. Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) / Elnur Alizade*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1845](#) (<insta-shark.com>).

The Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and notice sent via the Registrar's contact request form to the registrant of the disputed domain name on January 19, 2026. Even though the Respondent's website describes itself as a marketing agency based in the USA, the Respondent's website provides the address in the United Kingdom. The Respondent used a proxy service to register the disputed domain name and apparently resides in Bulgaria according to the contact information disclosed by the Registrar but sent an email communication to the Center on March 18, 2026, with an address in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) displayed in its signature block. Since it appears that the Respondent intentionally employs a privacy or proxy service merely to hide its identity, such concealment of the Respondent's identity supports an inference of bad faith registration and use. See section 3.6 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). See also *Instagram, LLC v. Niyaz Khan, Ergonomic solutions*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3290](#) (<privateinstaviewer.com>).

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element in paragraph 4(a) 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 <instalikeusa.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuji Yamaguchi/

Yuji Yamaguchi

Sole Panelist

Date: May 7, 2026