

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. james potty
Case No. D2026 -1726

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is james potty, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <slidesgrabby.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 23, 2026. On April 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 23, 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 (Privacy User #7584f504, PrivacyGuardian.Org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 24, 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 April 28, 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 May 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on June 2, 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 owns 14 trademark registrations for SLIDESHARE (the “SLIDESHARE Marks”) worldwide for use in connection with a variety of reporting, computer, electronic, and software related goods and services, including U.S. Registration No. 4212895, registered September 25, 2012, in classes 9, 35, and 42.

The Complainant has continuously used, and owned trademark registrations for the SLIDESHARE Marks in connection with the SlideShare goods and services since at least as early as 2006. The Complainant also owns and operates a website at the following domain name: <slideshare.net> (created April 4, 2006).

Since 2006, the Complainant has over 28,000,000 uploads in 40 content categories and serves over 80,000,000 professionals per month on “www.slideshare.net”. Hence, millions of people around the world have encountered or been exposed to the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE Marks, and millions of consumers have used, purchased, or otherwise subscribed to the Complainant’s SlideShare goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 12, 2025, and according to the evidence provided in the Complaint, it previously resolved to a website that displayed “Slideshare” and allowed Internet users to download copyrighted materials from the Complainant’s platform without subscribing to the Complainant’s SlideShare goods and services. The disputed domain name is no longer active.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE Marks because it incorporates the identical and recognizable first term “slides” in the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE Marks. The additional word “grabby” in the disputed domain name does not distinguish them from the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE Marks since the disputed domain name is used to explicitly allow users to illegally download copyrighted materials from the Complainant’s platform bearing the SLIDESHARE Marks.

The website at the disputed domain name is currently blocked as web browsers have identified it as distributing malware. However, archived versions of this website prominently depicts the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE Marks in their entirety, links to the Complainant’s website and the disputed domain name provides users the ability to download copyrighted content from the Complainant’s platform without subscribing to the Complainant’s SlideShare goods and services by acting as a proxy and manipulating the URL link. Indeed, the disputed domain name advertises itself as a free “SlideShare downloader” that is specifically targeted at disrupting the Complainant’s business, the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE Marks, and the Complainant’s SlideShare goods and services. The Respondent is specifically targeting the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE Marks through its choice of the disputed domain name to offer an illegal, unauthorized, and fraudulent tool to improperly download materials from the Complainant’s website that generally require a subscription to do so. Hence, the Respondent is taking advantage of Internet users typing an incorrect address when seeking to access the Complainant’s websites in order to create user confusion and otherwise direct traffic away from the Complainant’s website.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered well after the first use dates and/or trademark registration dates of the Complainant's SLIDESHARE Marks and after the Complainant's website was registered and operational. Upon registering the confusingly similar disputed domain name, the Respondent began using the Complainant's SLIDESHARE Marks in their entirety and advertising to its users that it offers the ability to avoid signing up for the Complainant's SlideShare goods and services by acting as a proxy and manipulating the target URL to allow for the free access and download of copyrighted documents that are ordinarily restricted to subscribers to the Complainant's website. This use of the Complainant's SLIDESHARE Marks indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Respondent is using the SLIDESHARE Marks and the disputed domain name and the SlideShare goods and services in bad faith to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SLIDESHARE Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

B. Respondent

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

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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. In the present case, the Panel has also taken note of the previous content of the website at the disputed domain name, which displayed the Complainant's SLIDESHARE Marks and purported to allow Internet users to download copyrighted materials from the Complainant's platform without any subscription. Therefore, the Panel finds that it appears prima facie that the Respondent seeks to target the Complainant's SLIDESHARE Marks through the disputed domain name, which confirms confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.15.

Although the addition of other term here "grabby", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed unauthorized access to illegally download copyrighted materials from the Complainant’s platform, or other types of fraud, can never 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 is specifically targeting the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE Marks through its choice of the disputed domain name to offer an illegal and unauthorized tool to improperly download materials from the Complainant’s website that generally require a subscription to do so. Hence, the Respondent is taking advantage of Internet users typing an incorrect address when seeking to access the Complainant’s website in order to create user confusion and otherwise direct traffic away from the Complainant’s website.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed unauthorized access to illegally download copyrighted materials from the Complainant’s platform, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. 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.

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 <slidesgrabby.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: June 16, 2026