

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. Ali Waheed, NADAnz

Case No. D2026-1727

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ali Waheed, NADAnz, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <scribdownloader.online> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (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 Domain Name. On April 24, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (NAMECHEAP INC) 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 27, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe 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 has provided a wide variety of computer, electronic and software-related goods under the SCRIBD mark (the “Mark”) since 2006. Since 2008 it has served over 1,950,000 paying subscribers and has over 200 million unique visitors per month to its website at “www.scribd.com”. Its Scribd app has over 1 million downloads.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a number of registered trademarks for SCRIBD including United States trademark number 3777227 registered on April 20, 2010, and International trademark number 1422028 registered on July 11, 2018.

The Domain Name was registered on April 9, 2025. It currently resolves to a parking page offering the Domain Name for sale for USD 1,500. The Complainant has adduced evidence that at the time of preparation of the Complaint, an attempt to access the Domain Name was blocked and returned a web page warning that the website at the Domain Name was a security threat and an apparent phishing scam.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.online”, the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the term “downloader”. The Panel finds that the addition of the term “downloader” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a strong prima facie case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but for a website which was previously blocked owing to a perceived security threat and phishing scam, and which now resolves to a parking page offering the Domain Name for sale for USD 1,500.

There is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the Domain Name. The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complaint or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

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.

The Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Mark which, in the Panel’s view, would be taken to refer only to the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Domain Name incorporates the term “downloader” which reinforces the Panel’s view that the Respondent intended to mislead Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark. The nature of the Domain Name and its blocking in light of a perceived security threat supports an allegation that the Domain Name was intended to be used for phishing or other inappropriate activity. In the Panel’s view, the use of a domain name for such activity, presumably with a view to commercial gain, amounts to paradigm bad faith registration and use for the purposes of the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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

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 Domain Name <scribdownloader.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: June 16, 2026