

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. Hamza Tariq, and Om Parkash Jaswani, UrduFeed
Case No. D2026-1610

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Hamza Tariq, Pakistan, and Om Parkash Jaswani, UrduFeed, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <downloadscribd.com> and <slidessaver.com> are registered with Dynadot 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 17, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) 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.

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 April 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 14, 2026. One of the Respondents sent email communications to the Center on April 18, and 24, 2026. On April 24, 2026, the Complainant requested to suspend the proceeding to explore settlement, and the proceeding was suspended on the same date. On May 27, 2026, the Complainant requested to reinstitute the proceeding and the proceeding was reinstituted on the same date. The new due date for Response was June 16, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of commencement of panel appointment process on June 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on June 22, 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 operates, since 2006, a global online platform for the publication, sharing, and discovery of presentations, documents, and similar professional content.

The Complainant is the owner of trade mark registrations in SCRIBD and in SLIDESHARE in multiple jurisdictions including the following:

- United States trade mark SCRIBD, Reg. No. 3777227 registered, on April 20, 2010; and
- United States trade mark SLIDESHARE, Reg. No. 4212895, registered on September 25, 2012.

The disputed domain name <downloadscribd.com> was registered on September 19, 2025 and the disputed domain name <slidessaver.com> was registered on March 24, 2025.

The disputed domain name <downloadscribd.com> does not currently point to any website with active content and it used to direct to a website purporting to allow the free download of “Scribd” documents and stating: “Scribd Downloader – Download Scribd Documents Safely in 2026”. The disputed domain name <slidessaver.com> directs to a website purporting to allow the free download of “Slideshare” documents and stating: “Free Slideshare Downloader – PPT & PDF” and “Fast & Easy Slideshare Downloader”.

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 respective trade marks SCRIBD and in SLIDESHARE.

The Complainant asserts that for the disputed domain name <downloadscribd.com>, the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests because the disputed domain name resolved to a website that requires users to click through for access to the website, an apparent phishing scam. As for the disputed domain name <slidessaver.com>, the Complainant points out that the associated website offers a tool to download the Complainant’s content without proper compensation or authorization, to conclude that this clearly does not constitute a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

Turning to bad faith, the Complainant highlights that both trade marks SCRIBD and SLIDESHARE have been used since 2006 and that the Respondents must have been aware of both trade marks, especially seeing as both disputed domain names were used for websites specifically targeting the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the Respondents registered and/or acquired the disputed domain names and use them in bad faith to intentionally attempt to extort money or attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. One of the Respondents sent an informal communication to the Center suggesting that it would be ready to explore a potential settlement.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name 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:

- the disputed domain names are registered through the same Registrar;
- the registrants are both reportedly located in the same city; and
- the websites to which the disputed domain names direct/used to direct have a similar layout and purpose.

On the balance of probabilities these commonalities suggest that both disputed domain names may be under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The Panel also notes that the Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's common control contentions.

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.

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 trade marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

In relation to the disputed domain name <downloadsribd.com>, the entirety of the SCRIBD trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SCRIBD trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, “download”, 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 <downloadsribd.com> and the SCRIBD trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In relation to the disputed domain name <slidessaver.com>, the Panel finds the SLIDESHARE trade mark can be recognized within the disputed domain name as a result of the inclusion of the first half of the trade mark SLIDESHARE. To reach this finding on recognizability, the Panel has taken into account the broader context of the case (website content trading off the Complainant’s reputation) which supports a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant’s trade mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <slidessaver.com> is confusingly similar to the SLIDESHARE trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.15.

Although the addition of other terms, here, “saver”, 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 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 disputed domain name <downloadsribd.com> does not currently point to any website with active content and it used to direct to a website purporting to allow the free download of Scribd documents and stating: “Scribd Downloader – Download Scribd Documents Safely in 2026”. The disputed domain name <slidessaver.com> directs to a website purporting to allow the free download of Slideshare documents and stating: “Free Slideshare Downloader – PPT & PDF” and “Fast & Easy Slideshare Downloader”. The Complainant contends and the Respondent did not deny, that the website associated with the disputed domain name <downloadsribd.com> is part of a phishing scam. As for the disputed domain name

<slidessaver.com> the Complainant argues that it purports to allow the free download of the Complainant's software without authorization and without payment of compensation to the Complainant.

Such uses of both disputed domain names are not of a type that could confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 must have known of the Complainant and its trade marks and decided to register the disputed domain names specifically to target the Complainant and its trade marks SCRIBD and SLIDESHARE given (i) the online visibility of both trade marks of the Complainant on the websites at the disputed domain names, (ii) the fact that the disputed domain names have been registered more than 12 years after the Complainant's trade mark, and (iii) the content made available on the websites which clearly demonstrates the Respondent's intent to specifically target the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

The disputed domain name <downloadscribd.com> does not currently point to any website with active content and it used to direct to a website purporting to allow the free download of Scribd documents and stating: "Scribd Downloader – Download Scribd Documents Safely in 2026". The disputed domain name <slidessaver.com> directs to a website purporting to allow the free download of Slideshare documents and stating: "Free Slideshare Downloader – PPT & PDF" and "Fast & Easy Slideshare Downloader". The Complainant contends and the Respondent did not deny, that the website associated with the disputed domain name <downloadscribd.com> is part of a phishing scam. As for the disputed domain name <slidessaver.com> the Complainant argues that it purports to allow the free download of the Complainant's software without authorization and without payment of compensation to the Complainant.

The use of the disputed domain names demonstrates a clear intent on the part of the Respondent to trade off the Complainant's goodwill and trade marks, to generate undue commercial gains. Such use constitutes bad faith.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 <downloadscribd.com> and <slidessaver.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: July 10, 2026