ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Scribd, Inc. v. Vivek Dobariya
Case No. D2026-0368

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Scribd, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by IPLA, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Vivek Dobariya, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <slideshare-downloader.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 31, 2026. On February 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 3, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 3, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 9, 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 February 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 2, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 10, 2026. On February 18, 2026 the proceedings were suspended until March 18, 2026, upon the Complainant's request; on March 17, 2026, the suspension was extended until April 18, 2026, and on April 20, 2026, the proceedings were reinstituted. The due date for Response was May 2, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of commencement of panel appointment process on May 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Azevedo as the sole panelist in this matter on May 6, 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, Scribd, Inc., is a Delaware corporation that operates an online platform for sharing and accessing digital content, including presentations, documents, and other professional materials, under the trademark SLIDESHARE.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the trademark SLIDESHARE worldwide, including United States Trademark Registration No. 4212895, filed on November 3, 2011 and registered on September 25, 2012.

The Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <slideshare.net>, which was created on April 4, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 31, 2024.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark and offering users a tool to download content from the Complainant's platform without authorization or subscription.

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 contends that:

(i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates the SLIDESHARE trademark in its entirety, together with the descriptive term "downloader", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The content of the website associated with the disputed domain name reinforces the likelihood of confusion, as it prominently displays the Complainant's trademark and specifically targets the Complainant's platform and services. UDRP panels have held that the content of a website may provide an indication as to a respondent's targeting of a specific trademark through the domain name chosen, and the context in which the domain name is being used is helpful to assess confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant. The disputed domain name is being used to provide an unauthorized tool allowing users to download copyrighted materials from the Complainant's platform without subscribing to the Complainant's services, which cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. Prior panels have found that the use of a domain name for illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. The Complainant is not aware of any trademark rights, domain name rights, or other rights that the Respondent has relating to the SLIDESHARE mark, nor has the Complainant ever authorized the Respondent to use its SLIDESHARE marks in connection with any goods or services.

(iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its SLIDESHARE trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent intentionally uses the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and by offering unauthorized access to content available through the Complainant's platform. The disputed domain name is also used in bad faith because it uses the Complainant's SLIDESHARE marks in their entirety without authorization.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions but only sent an email communication to the Center stating that he does not intend to contest the Complaint and consents to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to be entitled to a transfer of the disputed domain name, a complainant shall prove the following three elements:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 trademark SLIDESHARE is wholly encompassed within the disputed domain name, together with the additional term "-downloader", as well as with the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". 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 a hyphen and other terms (here, "-downloader") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such additions do 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 Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the use of its trademark to the Respondent, and the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is linked to a website offering users a tool to download content from the Complainant's platform (which would ordinarily require a subscription) without authorization or subscription, under a "SLIDESHARE DOWNLOADER" logo. However, according to the Complainant, the Respondent is not an authorized service provider, nor has obtained any permission for such use of the trademark.

Additionally, by encompassing the Complainant's trademark SLIDESHARE in the disputed domain name and entitling the respective website "SlideShare Downloader" and using in the manner described above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intended to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark. Further, the website at the disputed domain name features links to the Complainant's own website. Such use cannot be considered as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.3.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The Panel concludes that it is not likely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and that the registration of the disputed domain name was a mere coincidence.

Annex 4 to the Complaint shows registrations for the SLIDESHARE trademark obtained by the Complainant as early as in 2012. When the disputed domain name was registered (in 2024), the SLIDESHARE trademark had already been long used in connection with the Complainant's software services.

The disputed domain name includes the trademark SLIDESHARE in its entirety, just adding the term "-downloader". In fact, the adoption of the term "-downloader" amplifies the potential for confusion in the present case, in which the Complainant's trademark is used for offering users a tool to download content from the Complainant's platform without authorization or subscription.

This is reinforced by the content at the website linked to the disputed domain name - including reproductions of the Complainant’s trademark to offer a tool for downloading content from the Complainants platform that would ordinarily require a subscription - which makes it clear that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, likely for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Finally, the absence of a formal reply from the Respondent to the Complainant’s contentions and of any justification of the use of the trademark further supports a finding of bad faith in the present case. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <slideshare-downloader.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Azevedo/
Rodrigo Azevedo
Sole Panelist
Date: May 18, 2026