

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scholastic Inc. v. cody luke
Case No. D2026-0473

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Scholastic Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Frankfurt Kurnit Klein & Selz, PC, United States.

The Respondent is cody luke, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <scholasticpublishinginc.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 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 (Redacted for privacy / The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 5, 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 amended Complaints on February 9, and 12, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on March 11, 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, Scholastic Inc., was founded in 1920, and is a publisher and distributor of children's books, including e-books and audiobooks. It is a creator of bestselling children's books, literacy- and knowledge-building resources for schools including classroom magazines, and entertaining children's media. According to the Complainant, they are currently in 82 percent of U.S. elementary schools and through all of its touch points, reaches children globally in more than 135 countries.

The Complainant first commenced use of its SCHOLASTIC trademark in 1920, and is the owner of numerous trademark registrations in the United States, including the following:

- SCHOLASTIC, Registration No. 1677988, registered March 3, 1992, in class 42; and
- SCHOLASTIC and design, Registration No. 1567119, registered November 21, 1989, in class 16.

The Complainant promotes its products and services at its main website at <scholastic.com>.

The Respondent appears to be based in the United States. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on October 21, 2025, which resolved to a website promoting "Professional Help for Every Step of Your Publishing Journey", as well as "Book Fair & Event" services. The disputed domain name does not currently resolve to that content but rather shows "Account Suspended".

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SCHOLASTIC trademark. The disputed domain name contains the SCHOLASTIC mark in its entirety, and merely adds the words "publishing" and corporate term "inc". The Complainant contends that consumers are likely to believe that the disputed domain name originates from or is affiliated with, authorized or endorsed by the Complainant. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant avers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent cannot claim or show any rights to the disputed domain name that are superior to the Complainant's rights in the SCHOLASTIC trademark. The Respondent is using the Complainant's nearly identical trademark in the disputed domain name, as well as prominently using the nearly identical trademark on the top of the resolving website. Additionally, the "Scholastic" indication at the top of the page is in a large font size in connection with branding using an open book similar to the Complainant's flying book design. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name for book publishing and book marketing services, which are identical to the services for which the Complainant has registered and/or used their trademark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not acquired any legitimate trademark or service mark rights in the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered or acquired and is being used in bad faith. Since the resolving website had mimicked the Complainant's website, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time that the disputed domain name was registered or acquired.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name was an intentional attempt to attract, for its commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent's bad faith is evidenced by: (i) use of the Complainant's identical trademark in the disputed domain name, (ii) prominent use of the trademark on the top front portion of the website homepage in conjunction with an open book logo and using the Complainant's red color scheme, and (iii) use of the disputed domain name for book publishing and marketing services, which are identical to the services for which the Complainant has registered and used its trademark.

The Respondent is seeking to profit from the unauthorized association with the Complainant's trademark. In light of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark, Internet users will be confused as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name. As such, the Respondent used and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 SCHOLASTIC as a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the SCHOLASTIC mark is reproduced 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, "publishing" and "inc", 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.

Panels have found that domain names consisting of a trademark plus an additional term related to the Complainant's services cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, with the Complainant's SCHOLASTIC mark, plus the additional term "publishing" related to the Complainant's business, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent's website with content related to a self-publishing service, as well as similar images as the Complainant's, shows that the Respondent has clearly targeted the Complainant's SCHOLASTIC mark to promote its services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1; see also *Scholastic Inc. v. VV Brands*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2391](#); *Scholastic Inc. v. Kanwal Khan*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3695](#).

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant acquired rights in its well-known SCHOLASTIC mark. The Respondent made a deliberate misappropriation of the Complainant's mark to deceive Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name was associated with the Complainant. Without the Complainant's authorization, the Respondent used the Complainant's trademark and confusingly similar open book logo, as well as copying the look, colors, design, and font from the Complainant's website. Additionally, the Respondent's website promotes publishing services highly similar to those offered by the Complainant on its website.

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.

These circumstances include a domain name incorporating the complainant's mark plus an additional term such as a descriptive term that corresponds to the complainant's area of activity. In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known SCHOLASTIC mark plus the descriptive term "publishing", which corresponds to the Complainant's area of activity. Additionally, the Respondent has a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the domain name, as well as a failure to respond to the Complaint and rebut any of the Complainant's allegations and evidence.

Panels have also consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity, and including a descriptive term, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4; see also *Scholastic Inc. v. Nelson*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3731](#); *Scholastic Inc. v. Kanwal Khan*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3695](#).

Based on a totality of the evidence presented, the Panel finds that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and registered the disputed domain name in an attempt 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 the Respondent's website, under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith.

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 <scholasticpublishinginc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gary Saposnik/

Gary Saposnik

Sole Panelist

Date: March 24, 2026