

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. om parkash, Soccer Gears Store
Case No. D2026-1728

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is om parkash, Soccer Gears Store, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <downloderslides.com> is registered with Name.com, 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 disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) 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 29, 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 May 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on May 1, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of commencement of panel appointment process on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant offers reporting, computer, electronic, and software related goods and services.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for SLIDESHARE, including the United States Registration No. 4212895 for SLIDESHARE (word), registered on September 25, 2012, in International Classes 9, 35, and 42 of goods and services.

The Complainant owns the domain name <slideshare.net> registered on April 4, 2006 where it has, since 2006, over 28,000,000 uploads in 40 content categories and serves over 80,000,000 professionals per month.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 17, 2025 and provides users the ability to download copyrighted content from the Complainant's platform without subscribing to the Complainant's services, while displaying the Complainant's SLIDESHARE mark in its entirety. It provides a disclaimer at the bottom of the website stating that "Disclaimer: This website is for educational purposes only. We are not affiliated, associated, authorized, endorsed by, or in any way officially connected with SlideShare.net, LinkedIn Corporation, or any of their subsidiaries".

The Respondent appears to be located in Pakistan.

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 trademarks, because it incorporates the identical and recognizable term "slides" in the Complainant's trademarks, and prior UDRP panels have held that the incorporation of part of a mark is sufficient to establish that the domain name in dispute is confusingly similar to a complainant's registered mark. Furthermore, the additional word "downloaders" in the disputed domain name does not distinguish it from the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademarks, because it is a common misspelling of a descriptive term and increases the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks since the disputed domain name is used to explicitly allow users to fraudulently and illegally download copyrighted materials from the Complainant's platform bearing the SLIDESHARE trademarks. In addition, UDRP panels have held that the content of a website may provide an indication as to a respondent's targeting of a specific trademark through the domain name chosen, and the context in which the domain name is being used is helpful to assess confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. In this case, the website for the disputed domain name prominently depicts the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademarks through their most dominant and recognizable element and includes clear reference to the Complainant's website with screenshots of the Complainant's website showing how to illegally download documents without a subscription, with the Respondent acting as a proxy and manipulating the URL link.

As regards the second element of the Policy, the Complainant submits that the website at the disputed domain name provides users with the ability to download copyrighted content from the Complainant's platform without subscribing to the Complainant's services, while displaying the Complainant's SLIDESHARE mark in its entirety. Furthermore, the website at the disputed domain name indicates that "SlideShare is a well-known platform, and most people use it for educational purposes. They paid charges to download material. We solved the problem and created a SlideShare downloader online tool, which allows you to download slides for free of cost" and also includes a presentation of the Complainant. Furthermore, the Complainant submits it is not aware of any trademark rights, domain name rights, or other rights that the Respondent would have relating to the SLIDESHARE mark, nor has the Complainant ever authorized the Respondent to use its SLIDESHARE trademarks in connection with any goods or services.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, the Complainant argues that it and its predecessors in-interest have been using the SLIDESHARE trademarks since at least as early as 2006, many years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Complainant has senior trademark rights in the SLIDESHARE trademark. The disputed domain name gives explicit instructions for how to copy links from the Complainant's website while also linking to the Complainant's website, showing screenshots of the Complainant's homepage and discussing the Complainant's company history, showing knowledge of the Complainant by the Respondent. As regards the use described above, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith to intentionally attempt to extort money or attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. The email communications received by the Center from the Respondent on May 1, 2026 appear to be an automatic reply outlining conditions for interested guest blog post contributors and including fee and payment information in relation to such guest posts.

6. Discussion and Findings

No formal response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Accordingly, the Panel considers it can proceed to determine the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant as per paragraph 15(a) of the Rules. The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

Even if the Respondent has not formally replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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

While the Complainant's SLIDESHARE mark is not wholly incorporated in the disputed domain name, the "SLIDES" element of the Complainant's trademark is recognizable, and is combined with the misspelled version "downloader" of the descriptive term "downloader", evoking the Complainant's services. In addition, the content of the website connected to the disputed domain name, which displays the trademark SLIDESHARE and offers the Complainant's goods, confirms the Panel's findings on confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.15.

Therefore, taking into account the broader case context (website content) and on balance, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, "downloader", a misspelled version of the term "downloader") 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.

It has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

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.

The Complainant claims that it never authorized the Respondent to use its SLIDESHARE trademarks in connection with any goods or services. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name as provided by paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

Rather, according to evidence in the case file, the disputed domain name is used to host a website that purports to offer the Complainant's services at no cost. There is a disclaimer for the lack of affiliation of the website with the certain entities, but not with the trademark holder, and it is only included at the bottom of the website after a long home page, which makes it quite difficult to notice and consider, so its existence does not appear as likely to prevent the confusion of Internet users. The Panel also considers the fact that, despite the disclaimer on the website at the disputed domain name mentioning that the website is for educational purposes alone, the automatic replies received from the Respondent mentioned fees and payment details for posting guest posts on its website. Given also the content at the disputed domain name prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark, the assertion that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is for "educational" purposes is not convincing. No educational purpose is served by the content of the Respondent's website, which displays prominently the Complainant's mark along with information related to the Complainant's business. Instead, it is more likely than not that the real purpose of the Respondent's website is to monetize visits by Internet users who have mistakenly believed, because of the disputed domain name, that the Respondent's website is affiliated with or associated with the Complainant. This cannot amount in the Panel's view to a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed offering unauthorized access to copyrighted material available only to subscribers to the Complainant's platform which amounts to fraudulent activity) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

In the present case, the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has failed to come forward with any explanation to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and has not refuted the prima facie case made by the Complainant.

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.

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.

According to the un rebutted assertions of the Complainant, its SLIDESHARE trademark was widely used in commerce well before the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark and purporting to offer the Complainant's goods and services at no cost. Under these circumstances, it is most likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Respondent provided no explanations for why it registered the disputed domain name.

As regards the use, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to confuse Internet users and enable them to bypass the Complainant's platform access controls amounts to fraudulent activity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. In what concerns the disclaimer on the website at the disputed domain name, as discussed in section 3.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure the finding of bad faith, when the overall circumstances of the case point in this direction, especially the automatic replies from the Respondent, as described above. In this case, considering the configuration of the website at which the disputed domain name redirects with the Complainant's trademark repetitively displayed, the Panel considers that the disclaimer is not enough as to avoid the likelihood of confusion. Moreover, the Respondent has not participated in these proceedings and has failed to rebut the Complainant's contentions or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use.

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 <downlodesslides.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: June 12, 2026