ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. Suman Naskar and Sumayyah IDREES
Case No. D2026-1608

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Suman Naskar, India, and Sumayyah IDREES, Pakistan.

2. Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <slideshare.pro> and <slidesharetool.com> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 15, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy elf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 17, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 22, 2026. One of the Respondents sent two email communications to the Center on April 22, 2026, and the Complainant requested a suspension of the proceedings on the same day. The proceedings were suspended until May 22, 2026, and were reinstituted on June 2, 2026, upon the Complainant's request.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any formal response.

The Center appointed Martin Michaus Romero as the sole panelist in this matter on July 15, 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 states:

1. It is a Delaware corporation, headquartered in San Francisco, California, United States;

2. It is the owner of the SLIDESHARE trademark (the "SLIDESHARE Marks") in different jurisdictions, by virtue of the assignment of trademark rights, executed in March 2024, by and between Slideshare, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, acting as an assignor and the Complainant acting as an assignee;

3. It owns multiple trademark registrations for the SLIDESHARE Marks worldwide for use in connection with a variety of reporting computer, electronic and software related goods and services;

4. The SLIDESHARE trademark was registered in the United States, on September 25,2012, under the number 4,212,895 in International Classes 9, 35 and 42, with a first use in commerce date of October 4, 2006.

5. The SLIDESHARE Marks are also registered in Argentina, Brazil, Canada, European Union, India, Mexico and United Kingdom.

6. The disputed domain name <slideshare.pro> was registered on July 24, 2025, and the disputed domain name <slidesharetool.com> on May 5, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to websites which referenced the Complainant and purportedly offered services to download the Complainant's products. The website at the disputed domain name <slideshare.pro> also displayed the Complainant's old hand holding logo and stated at the bottom to be "the official SlideShare Downloader tool."

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 names.

The Complainant contends that:

1. The Complainant and its predecessors-in-interest have continuously used, and owned trademark registrations for, the SLIDESHARE Marks in connection with its computer software goods and services since at least as early as 2006;

2. It owns and operates the domain name <slideshare.net>, created April 4, 2006;

3. The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the SLIDESHARE Marks and domain name <slideshare.net>;

4. The disputed domain names were registered well after the first use dates and/or trademark registration dates of the SLIDESHARE Marks and after the Complainant's website had been registered and operational;

5. The disputed domain name <slideshare.pro> uses the Complainant's old hand holding logo to promote the ability to download copyrighted content from the Complainant's platform, which is clear evidence of bad faith; and

6. The disputed domain name <slidesharetool.com> also unduly uses the old hand holding logo, as well as advertises "SlideShare Downloader has a simple interface that provides open access to download huge amounts of content from Slide Share […]".

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On April 22, 2026, as referenced above in section 3, the registrant of the disputed domain name <slideshare.pro> consented to the transfer of that domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probability that:

(i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
(ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and
(iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Given that the Respondents did not file a formal response to the Complaint filed by the Complainant, the Panel proceeds in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 5(f) and 15 of the Rules; that is, the Panel will decide the dispute based on the statements and documents submitted, and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law it deems applicable. Accordingly, since the Respondents did not dispute the Complainant's allegations, this Panel accepts as true the Complainant's reasonable assertions, and, consequently, certain inferences may be drawn therefrom.

6.1. Preliminary Matter – Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The Complainant requested consolidation of the disputes, given that the Complaint was filed against two different registrants within a single proceeding, and based its request on the following:

1. The two disputed domain names are under common control, so consolidation would be fair and equitable for the Parties, making the proceeding more efficient;

2. Both registrants use gmail.com email addresses;

3. The disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period of time, specifically on May 5, 2025, and July 24, 2025, with the same Registrar, which supports the conclusion that they form part of a coordinated registration campaign;

4. The composition of the disputed domain names as well as their similarities in use, the uniform structure of the WhoIs data, and the temporal proximity of the registrations together support the inference that they were registered and are managed by the same person or by a coordinated group acting in concert; and

5. It is highly likely that the registrants are in fact the same person or are acting under common control. Processing multiple separate complaints would result in unnecessary duplication of time, effort, and costs for the Complainant.

Section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") sets out certain considerations that should be taken into account when a complaint has been filed against multiple registrants. These include, among others:

(i) Whether the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control;
(ii) Whether consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties;
(iii) The identity(ies) of the registrants, including any pseudonyms;
(iv) The registrants' contact information, including email address(es), postal address(es), or telephone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities;
(v) The relevant IP addresses, name servers, or web hosting(s);
(vi) The content or design of the websites corresponding to the disputed domain names; and/or
(vii) The nature of the trademarks at issue.

Based on the arguments presented, the evidence submitted, the Respondents' lack of objection, and the similarities in use of the disputed domain names, pursuant to the powers conferred under paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, the Panel is empowered to decide on a party's request for consolidation of multiple domain name disputes. Accordingly, in keeping with the Policy and the Rules, the request for consolidation of the multiple domain name disputes is granted, and both Respondents will hereafter be referred to in this Decision as the "Respondent".

6.2. Substantive Matters

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 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 mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <slidesharetool.com> is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy, and <slideshare.pro> is identical thereto. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The addition of the term "tool" in the disputed domain name <slidesharetool.com> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domains are viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such are disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Considering that the disputed domain names reproduce the trademark SLIDESHARE in its entirety, 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 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 with 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent has neither used the disputed domain names for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor for a legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose. The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark, coupled with the use to which they have been put, indicates the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the respective websites .

The Complainant is not aware of any trademark rights or other rights that the Respondent has relating to the SLIDESHARE Marks, nor has the Complainant ever authorized the Respondent to use its SLIDESHARE Marks.

As such, in the Panel's view, the disputed domain names were created with the intention to mislead Internet users into believing that there is a connection or association with the Complainant.

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

C. Registered and Used 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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel notes that:

1. The Respondent must have been aware of the existence of the Complainant and its activities and business operations under the SLIDESHARE Marks, at the time of registering the disputed domain names;

2. The disputed domain names are identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark;

3. The Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark and domain names significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain names;

4. The Complainant has not granted an authorization, consent or license to the Respondent to use the SLIDESHARE mark, as part of the disputed domain names;

5. The disputed domain names were registered well after the first use dates and/or trademark registrations dates of the Complainant SLIDESHARE trademark and after the Complainant's website was registered and operational; and

6. The websites for the disputed domain names unduly promote the ability to download copyrighted content from the Complainant's platform without subscribing to the Complainant's services; the website at the disputed domain name <slideshare.pro> also displayed the Complainant's old hand holding logo and stated at the bottom to be "the official SlideShare Downloader tool."

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the disputed domain names have been registered and used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 names <slideshare.pro> and <slidesharetool.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Martin Michaus-Romero/
Martin Michaus-Romero
Sole Panelist
Date: July 29, 2026