

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scholastic Inc. v. Edward Alan

Case No. D2026-0477

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Edward Alan, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <scholasticpublishinggroup.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, 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 Domain Name. On February 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name, which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 6, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaints on February 9 and February 12, 2026, respectively.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was March 5, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 6, 2026.

The Center appointed John C. McElwaine as the sole panelist in this matter on March 12, 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

Founded in 1920, Complainant is a New York-based publishing company and one of the world's largest publishers and distributors of children's books and educational materials. Complainant owns numerous trademarks for the term "Scholastic." Relevant to this matter, three of Complainant's trademark registrations are as follows:

- SCHOLASTIC (design), U.S. Reg. No. 1,567,119, registered November 21, 1989, in International Class 16;
- SCHOLASTIC, U.S. Reg. No. 1,677,988, registered March 3, 1992, in International Class 42; and
- SCHOLASTIC, U.S. Reg. No. 2,711,978, registered April 29, 2003, in International Class 41.

Collectively, these registered trademark rights are referred to as the "SCHOLASTIC Mark".

Complainant operates its official website at "www.scholastic.com".

The Domain Name was created on September 27, 2025. It resolves to a website that imitates Complainant's official website, prominently featuring Complainant's Scholastic name and a logo similar to that of Complainant and copying the look and feel of Complainant's site to purportedly offer book publishing and marketing services.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

With respect to the first element, Complainant states that it owns longstanding and well-known rights in the SCHOLASTIC Mark, and that the Domain Name is identical or, at a minimum, confusingly similar to that mark. The Domain Name incorporates Complainant's SCHOLASTIC Mark in its entirety and merely adds the descriptive terms "publishing group." Complainant argues that the inclusion of these generic terms does not avoid confusion, as the SCHOLASTIC Mark remains instantly recognizable within the Domain Name. In fact, according to Complainant, the Domain Name creates the same overall impression as Complainant's SCHOLASTIC Mark, and consumers are likely to assume that the Domain Name is associated with Complainant. Complainant further notes that the website at the Domain Name prominently displays the Scholastic name and a logo similar to Complainant's flying book design, which reinforces the confusing similarity.

With respect to the second element, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has never authorized Respondent to use the SCHOLASTIC Mark or to register any domain name incorporating it. Complainant maintains that Respondent is not commonly known by "Scholastic" or any similar name; rather, Respondent's name is "Edward Alan," which has no connection to the Domain Name. According to Complainant, Respondent's sole reason for choosing the Domain Name was to exploit Complainant's famous trademark. Complainant contends that Respondent is using the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant and offer services identical to Complainant's book publishing and marketing services, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. Such use is inherently deceptive and made for Respondent's commercial gain, and thus cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests on Respondent.

With respect to the third element, Complainant argues that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. Complainant's SCHOLASTIC Mark has been in use since 1920 and is internationally renowned in the publishing industry. Complainant submits that Respondent clearly targeted Complainant's mark when registering the Domain Name in 2025, many decades after the mark became famous. According to Complainant, the content of Respondent's website, which copies the design of Complainant's logo, branding, and website design, confirms that Respondent was well aware of Complainant's rights and intentionally set out to create a fraudulent association. Complainant asserts that Respondent's conduct falls under several of the Policy's bad-faith examples, including an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with Complainant's mark (Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv)). The impersonation of Complainant on the website is, in Complainant's view, clear evidence of bad faith. Complainant also notes that it has successfully pursued multiple similar UDRP cases against other copycat domain names, indicating a pattern of bad-faith behavior targeting the SCHOLASTIC Mark. For these reasons, Complainant concludes that Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name are in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Even though Respondent has defaulted, paragraph 4 of the Policy requires that, in order to succeed in this UDRP proceeding, Complainant must still prove its assertions with evidence demonstrating:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) 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.

Because of Respondent's default, the Panel may accept as true the reasonable factual allegations stated within the Complaint and may draw appropriate inferences therefrom. See *St. Tropez Acquisition Co. Limited v. AnonymousSpeech LLC and Global House Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1779](#); *Bjorn Kassoe Andersen v. Direction International*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0605](#); see also paragraph 5(f) of the Rules ("If a Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint"). Having considered the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, and applicable principles of law, the Panel's findings on each of the above-cited elements are as follows:

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 Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has provided evidence of trademark registrations for the SCHOLASTIC Mark, and thus, has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Domain Name fully incorporates Complainant's distinctive mark SCHOLASTIC Mark and adds only the words "publishing group." The Panel finds that the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity because Complainant's SCHOLASTIC Mark is immediately recognizable within the Domain Name. As noted in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8, where a domain name consists of a trademark combined with a descriptive term, the trademark typically remains recognizable within the domain name, and

the additional of other terms, which may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant must make a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, after which the burden of production shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

On the record before it, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant confirms that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the SCHOLASTIC Mark. There is no indication that Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name or by any name incorporating "Scholastic." To the contrary, Respondent's name is given as "Edward Alan," which is unrelated to the term "Scholastic." Complainant has also presented evidence that the Domain Name is being used to host a website impersonating Complainant and offering competing services. Such use of Complainant's trademark to deceive consumers is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Instead, Respondent's use appears calculated to mislead Internet users for Respondent's own commercial gain, which is the antithesis of a legitimate interest. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy¹ or otherwise.

Because Respondent has not submitted a Response or any evidence to rebut Complainant's prima facie showing, no claim to rights or legitimate interests has been established. Respondent has presented no justification for its registration of a domain name that contains Complainant's trademark and the operation of a website that impersonates Complainant. In the absence of any explanation, the most likely inference is that Respondent selected the Domain Name to trade on the goodwill of Complainant's trademarks. Such conduct does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. The Panel notes that Respondent's use of the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant and potentially divert Complainant's customers is inherently illegitimate and cannot confer any rights in the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1 ("Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., ... passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.")

In addition, the Panel finds that the composition of the Domain Name, which includes Complainant's mark and an additional term related to Complainant's business, actually serves to enhance the impression of an association with Complainant.

The Panel finds that Complainant has made a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, which Respondent has not rebutted. The Panel concludes that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

¹ The Policy, paragraph 4(c), provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent could demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name: "(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or (ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or (iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue."

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, Complainant must show that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. A non-exhaustive list of factors constituting bad faith registration and use is set out in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

Bad faith registration can be found where respondents “knew or should have known” of a complainant’s trademark rights and nevertheless registered domain names in which they had no rights or legitimate interests. As detailed above, Respondent registered the Domain Name that is confusingly similar to the SCHOLASTIC Mark. There is no explanation for Respondent to have chosen to register the Domain Name other than to intentionally trade off the goodwill and reputation of Complainant’s trademarks or otherwise create a false association with Complainant. With no response from Respondent, this claim is undisputed.

Furthermore, Respondent’s use of the Domain Name to run a copycat website cannot be characterized as anything other than bad faith. The unauthorized and misleading use of Complainant’s trademark and a logo that is similar to Complainant’s design by Respondent is evidence of bad faith use under the doctrine of passing off. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4, observes that using a domain name for impersonation or other fraudulent purposes is unequivocal evidence of bad faith. The Panel agrees with that principle and finds it directly applicable to Respondent’s conduct in this case. Respondent’s website was plainly designed to confuse users and potentially divert business or extract information under false pretenses, which is manifestly in bad faith.

Thus, the Panel finds on the record before it that Respondent’s intention in registering the Domain Name was to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

For the reasons set forth above, the Panel holds that Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy and has established that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name 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 Domain Name, <scholasticpublishinggroup.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/John C. McElwaine/

John C. McElwaine

Sole Panelist

Date: March 26, 2026