

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scholastic Inc. v. Syed Mujtaba Naqvi, Digital Point LLC
Case No. D2026-0478

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Syed Mujtaba Naqvi, Digital Point LLC, U.S.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <scholasticbookspublisher.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (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 6, 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 February 6, 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 February 9, 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 February 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2026. On March 5, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Center, filing the Response and indicating its willingness to settle the dispute. On the same day, the Center sent an email regarding possible settlement to the Parties. On March 10, 2026, the Complainant requested for a suspension of the proceeding, and the proceeding was suspended until April 9, 2026,

according to the Notification of Suspension. On April 6, 2026, the Complainant requested for an extension of the suspension, and the proceeding was further suspended until May 9, 2026. On May 4, 2026, the Complainant requested for an extension of the suspension, and the proceeding was further suspended until June 6, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Complainant requested for reinstitution of the proceeding, and the proceeding was reinstituted on June 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 Scholastic Inc. has become one of the world's largest publishers and distributors of children's books, including ebooks and audiobooks. The Complainant is a leading creator of bestselling children's books, literacy- and knowledge building resources for schools including classroom magazines, and award-winning, entertaining children's media. Scholastic is currently in 82 percent of U.S. elementary schools and through all of its touch points, reaches children globally in more than 135 countries.

Through over a century's worth of use of its iconic SCHOLASTIC mark, particularly when paired with its instantly recognizable "flying book" logo, the Complainant has gained household reputation as a highly trusted source of quality literature and learning materials for young, intellectually eager, yet still vulnerable and developing minds.

The Complainant first commenced use of its SCHOLASTIC mark (the "Trademark") in 1920. The Complainant owns dozens of incontestable registrations with the United States Patent and Trademark Office for the Trademark, including but not limited to: SCHOLASTIC (Design) U.S. Registration No. 1,567,119, registered November 21, 1989, for Class 16: Student newspapers, magazines, books, charts, workbooks, book club catalogs for educational use; SCHOLASTIC (Design) U.S. Registration No. 1,569,434, registered December 5, 1989, for Class 9: Computer and video programs for educational use; and SCHOLASTIC (Design) U.S. Registration No. 2,592,654, registered July 9, 2002, for Class 28: Games and toys, namely, action skill games, board games, hand held units for playing video games, stuffed toys, plush toys, dolls, puppets, toy action figures and accessories therefor, toy action figure kits and parts thereof, flying discs, kites, bath toys, pool floats for recreational use, inflatable toys, toy cube puzzles and manipulative puzzles, jigsaw puzzles, pull toys, bean bags, infant rattles, jack-in-the-box, toy musical instruments, balloons, toy educational scientific kits used for teaching children experiments about exploration, toy educational scientific kits used for teaching children living and growing experiments; toy building blocks and connecting links, sold separately and as kits for construction of toy houses, building, household furnishings, robots, doll figures and vehicular toys.

On August 25, 2025, the disputed domain was created and registered. On October 17, 2025, the disputed domain came to the Complainant's attention because the corresponding website displayed advertising book publishing and marketing services, including using landing page images showing legitimate Scholastic books, such as the *The Hunger Games* series.

Respondent is using the disputed domain to host a website featuring the Complainant's identical registered Trademark to purportedly offer services identical to the Complainant's services. The disputed domain is used for Respondent's commercial gain, and to divert business from 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 contends that the website resolved to from disputed domain contains the Complainant's entire and identical Trademark, which is the subject of numerous U.S. trademark registrations. The disputed domain creates the same, or essentially the same, commercial impression as the Complainant's Trademark and is similar thereto in sight, sound, and meaning. The disputed domain name merely adds to the Trademark the words "book publisher", which are descriptive in this context. Consumers are likely to believe that the Disputed Domain originates from or is affiliated with, authorized or endorsed by the Complainant. 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 the Trademark. Accordingly, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for commercial gain without authority. The Complainant's rights in the Trademark were firmly established before Respondent registered 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 Trademark.

B. Respondent

The Respondent responded to the Complaint by consenting to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. This consent is provided in the interest of settlement and to avoid further administrative costs, and is given without admission of the allegations of bad faith or lack of legitimate interest. The Respondent further contested confusing similarity and claimed a legitimate interest in that it was using the disputed domain name to operate a legitimate ghostwriting and self-publishing business. The Respondent further requested a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

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

The entirety of the 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 "book publisher" -- may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 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 use of the disputed domain to host a website in competition with Complainant to divert consumers for commercial gain constitutes 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 notes the Complainant’s long history and strong reputation in the SCHOLASTIC mark, in particular in the publishing industry in the U.S., where the Respondent claims to operate. In this regard, the Panel finds the Respondent’s general claims of “Lack of Knowledge/Targeting” and no intent to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant to be unconvincing, and in the context of misleading aspects of the Respondent’s use rather suggest that the Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant and has sought to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

The Panel does not find that the Complaint was brought in bad faith or that this is a case of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

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 <scholasticbookspublisher.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: June 19, 2026