

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. Webs Pulse and Sohail Habib
Case No. D2026-1609

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Webs Pulse, Pakistan, and Sohail Habib, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <saveslide.com> and <slidesaver.net> are registered with NameCheap, 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 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 April 17, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the disputed domain name associated with a different underlying registrant 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.

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 April 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on May 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on May 29, 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 is a United States company doing business in the computer and software industry.

The Complainant is the owner of a portfolio of SLIDESHARE marks in different jurisdictions which have been assigned via agreement from the Complainant's legal entity SlideShare, LLC. As such and before the United States Patent and Trademark Office with registration No. 4212895, registered on September 25, 2012, and before the European Union Intellectual Property Office with registration No. 010853919, registered on November 26, 2012.

The Complainant is the registrant of the domain name <slideshare.net>, registered on April 4, 2006, hosting the platform where it offers its services under a subscription plan.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows: <saveslide.com> on December 5, 2025, and <slidesaver.net> on September 13, 2024.

Both disputed domain names resolve to websites where the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark is prominently displayed and offer a tool to download copyrighted content from the Complainant's platform without a subscription. The website at the disputed domain name <saveslide.com> includes a disclaimer at the bottom of the website which states that its offered "Slideshare Downloader" tool is a "third party helper tool. It is not linked to Slideshare.net in any way". The website's copyright notice at the bottom of the website further states that "SaveSlide" is "[n]ot affiliated with Slideshare...".

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's SLIDESHARE marks since they incorporate the identical or nearly identical dominant and recognizable first term "slide" in the Complainant's trademark rights. Moreover, the word "save" or "saver" as a descriptive term does not distinguish the domain names from the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademarks.

The Complainant alleges it has no record that the Respondents are the owners of any trademark rights, domain name rights, or other rights relating to "SlideShare", nor has the Complainant ever authorized the Respondents to use its trademarks in connection with any goods or services. Additionally, says the Complainant, nothing in the Respondents' Whols information, or any other publicly available source suggests the Respondents are commonly known by either domain name.

Further, the disputed domains are being used for illegal activity which is deemed to be considered in bad faith. Indeed, the Complainant asserts bad faith based on the attempt of the Respondents to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites or location or of a product or service on the websites or location.

The Complainant also asserts bad faith registration based upon the Respondents' awareness of its marks and business.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that both the filed addresses and contact information are falsified. Accordingly, for <saveaside.com> the Respondent is using an address in Pakistan while the business appears to be in the United States. And for <slidesaver.net> the provided address in the United Kingdom does not exist and the Respondent provided a phone number using the Pakistan phone code.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain names' registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that both disputed domain names targeted SLIDESHARE trademarks, are using the same Registrar, have a similar composition pattern (e.g., "slide" plus a "save" or "saver" terms), and both resolve to websites where SLIDESHARE is prominently displayed and a tool is offered to download the Complainant's goods without a subscription.

Concerning fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

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

There are no exceptional circumstances within paragraph 5(f) of the Rules to prevent the Panel from determining the dispute based upon the Complaint, notwithstanding the failure of the Respondent to file a Response. Under paragraph 14(a) of the Rules in the event of such a “default” the Panel is still required “to proceed with a decision on the complaint”, whilst under paragraph 14(b) it “shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate”. This dispute resolution procedure is accepted by the domain name registrant as a condition of registration.

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 Panel finds the dominant element (“SLIDE”) of the Complainant’s mark is recognizable in the disputed domain names and is combined with the terms “save” and “saver”. In addition, both disputed domain names resolve to websites targeting and displaying the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE mark. On balance, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark for purposes of the first element of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.15: “...it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name.”

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 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 Panel notes that none of the circumstances described in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy can be inferred from the file.

The Panel finds that using the disputed domain names to offer unauthorized access to copyrighted material available only to subscribers to the Complainant's platform does not amount to a bona fide offering. In light of this activity, the disclaimer and copyright notice included at the bottom of the website at the domain name <saveslide.com> is not sufficient in the circumstances of this case to confer a legitimate interest to the Respondent.

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.

As noted above in the first element analysis, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark and therefore, the Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed the domain names.

As regards the use, both disputed domain names are used to offer unauthorized access to copyrighted material available only to subscribers to the Complainant's platform, which is bad faith. The disclaimer is displayed at the footer of the website at the domain name <saveslide.com> but is not sufficiently prominent to support a finding that the Respondent has undertaken reasonable steps to avoid unfairly passing itself off as related to the Complainant, or to otherwise confuse users. Rather, in the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds such a disclaimer is an admission that users may be confused.

Additionally, the Panel notes that the Respondent has provided seemingly false contact information in the registration details.

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 <saveslide.com> and <slidesaver.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: June 12, 2026