

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. Asad Ali
Case No. D2026-3443

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Asad Ali, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <freeslidesharedownloader.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 3, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 12, 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 (Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu (Registrar)/Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 the same day.

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 August 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2026. The Respondent submitted the Response and sent an email communication to the Center on September 1, 2026. On September 9, 2026, the Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing. On September 12, 2026, the Center commenced the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 seated in California, USA. It operates an online service enabling Internet users seeking to design a presentation deck to download complete presentations in their original file format and to use artificial intelligence to modify their content to suit the user's needs. The Complainant's collection comprises more than 25 million presentations across many topics. Access to the material provided by the Complainant is granted only to subscribers of the Complainant's platform (as per Annex 6 to the Complaint). The Complainant owns numerous trademarks worldwide in the designation SLIDESHARE, among them the following (as per Annex 4 to the Complaint):

- USA trademark registration no. 4,212,895 SLIDESHARE (word), registered on September 25, 2012 for goods and services on Classes 9, 35 and 42;
- European Union trade mark registration no. 010853919 SLIDESHARE (word), registered on November 26, 2012 for services in Class 35;
- India trademark registration no. 2326000 SLIDESHARE (word), registered on May 3, 2012 for goods and services in Classes 9, 35 and 42.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <slideshare.net> where it hosts its platform and services to download copyrighted third-party presentations at a subscription price as well as the possibility for creators of presentations to enter into an agreement with the Complainant to upload their presentations (as per Annex 6 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on September 14, 2025. Before the commencement of the present proceeding, it was used to resolve to a webpage displaying the text "Free SlideShare Downloader – Download PPT, PPTX & PDF Instantly – Download presentations from SlideShare" along with directions on how to download presentations from the Complainant at "100 % free, no watermarks, high quality". The service is described to be "designed for students, educators, researchers and professionals who need reliable offline access to SlideShare" content. The website of the Respondent also displayed an advertisement for a Fairmont hotel in San Francisco with a "BOOK YOUR STAY" button (as per Annex 7 to the Complaint).

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 a trademark, in which the Complainant has rights. On this, the Complainant refers to its SLIDESHARE trademark registrations. This trademark is, according to the Complainant, fully included in the disputed domain name, with the additional descriptive terms "free" and "downloader". These terms do not sufficiently distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark, as they indicate to the Internet user that the website provided under the disputed domain name serves to illegally download copyrighted material for free from the Complainant's SLIDESHARE platform.

On the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name is used to enable users to download copyrighted content from the Complainant's platform. This is, according to the Complainant, an illegal activity, and to provide unauthorized access to material on a third-party platform does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services to confer any legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant claims that it is not aware of any trademark or other rights that the Respondent has in the Complainant's trademarks, and that the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks, and that no available source suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

On the third element, the Complainant stresses that its trademark rights by far predate the registration of the disputed domain name. By this registration, the Respondent, according to the Complainant, began advertising to his users that it offers the ability to avoid having to sign up to the Complainant's services by acting as a proxy and manipulate the target URL to allow for free download of copyrighted documents from the Complainant's platform. The Complainant argues that the use of the disputed domain name for illegal activity such as to provide unauthorized access to a third-party platform is evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that he is a university student (as per student identity card in Annex 1 to the Response). On the first element, he acknowledges that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark and that the additional terms were used descriptively in the context of an academic project. On the second element, he claims that he has developed his website as an academic project for website development and was awarded second position for his project (as per picture of an alleged prize in Annex 2 to the Response). When registering the disputed domain name and creating the website, so the Respondent argues, he had no knowledge it could infringe any rights of the Complainant. His project, so he puts forth, was bona fide, academic in nature and not operated commercially. Upon receiving the Complaint, he immediately recognized the problem and offered an apology. He would remove the downloading functionality and continue to use the disputed domain name exclusively for non-commercial blogging. On the third element, the Respondent claims that he registered and used the disputed domain name in good faith as part of a university academic project, without any intention to sell it, disrupt the Complainant's business or attract users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

C. Complainant's Supplemental Filing

In its Supplemental Filing, the Complainant replies to the Response and stresses, on the first element, that the Respondent acknowledged that the disputed domain name incorporated the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademark when he registered the disputed domain name, and that the purpose of the Respondent's website was to provide functionality enabling users to download content from the Complainant's platform. Consequently, the Complainant asserts, that the Respondent intentionally selected the Complainant's trademark for the disputed domain name because he was creating a service specifically directed at the Complainant's platform.

As to the Respondent's contentions on the second element, namely that the website constituted a bona fide university project, the Complainant counters that the evidence submitted does not substantiate such assertion. Annex 1 to the Response, while being a student identification document, establishes at most that the Respondent is or was a student; it does not establish that the disputed domain name or the downloader operating from it was an assigned or approved university project. Annex 2 to the Response, being a photo of an award or trophy, does not connect the award to the particular project of the Respondent. According to the Complainant, the Respondent should have adduced more evidence against the prima facie case made by the Complainant. Besides that, the Complainant claims that developing a website in connection with university coursework does not in itself create a right or legitimate interest to incorporate the Complainant's trademark into the disputed domain name. The Policy does not provide an exemption for student or other non-commercial projects. In addition, the word "free" and "downloader"

precisely describe the unauthorized Complainant specific functionality the Respondent elected to provide. In addition, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's apology and promises to remove the downloader and change the website do not retroactively create rights or legitimate interests.

On the third element, the Complainant stresses that the Respondent does not deny that he knew of SlideShare upon registration of the disputed domain name. His alleged lack of understanding that the disputed domain name and functionality would infringe the Complainant's right does not negate deliberate targeting. The Respondent's post-Complaint apologies and promises and asserted non-commercial intent do, according to the Complainant, not rebut the registration and use in bad faith.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Procedural Issue

Paragraph 10 of the Rules vests the panel with the authority to determine the admissibility of the supplemental filings. According to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#)), section 4.6, the party submitting such filing should clearly show its relevance for the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response. In the present case, the Complainant has explained the relevance of its Supplemental Filing to the case, did not repeat or expand on anything contained in its Complaint and solely addressed the Respondent's newly asserted contentions and evidence, on which the Complainant could not have commented in its Complaint. Also, the Supplemental Filing did not impede due expedition of the proceeding. Consequently, the Panel deems the Supplemental Filing relevant to the case and expressly admits it for consideration in the decision-making process.

B. 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "free" and "downloader", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

C. 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. While the Respondent has not denied the fact that, through the functionality offered at the website under the disputed domain name, he has provided access to the Complainant's platform without the Complainant's authorization, the Respondent has come forward with arguments to support his position of having rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

(1) The Respondent stated to be a student and presents a student ID in his name issued by a university in Pakistan and valid until December 31, 2025 (as per Annex 1 to the Response) and the picture of an award type object displaying "5th Talent Festival 2025 Appreciation Award is presented for seeking 2nd position in CS Expo: Web Development" (as per Annex 2 to the Response) and alleging that this is the prize he has been awarded for the creation of the website under the disputed domain name. On this, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that the award does not mention the name of the Respondent and does not make a connection to the particular project of the Respondent. Thus, it is ineffectual as evidence to support the contention of the Respondent. Besides that, the Policy does not provide for an exemption of student projects or other noncommercial projects. Rather, the Complainant correctly points to the fact that the test under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy and under [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) is indeed whether the particular use made under the disputed domain name is genuinely fair, without having regard to a respondent's purported motives.

(2) The Respondent has claimed that the project was academic in nature. He states to have invested substantial resources into the project in the belief that he was creating a useful educational tool for students. The Panel has assessed this contention in light of the website content under the disputed domain name (as per Annex 7 to the Complaint) and notes, that the audience targeted by the Respondent were not only students or other academic personnel (notwithstanding the fact that giving access to copyrighted material to such users may also lead to copyright infringement), but also "professionals who need reliable offline access to SlideShare content", i.e. also users who may need content from the Complainant's platform for commercial purposes and who could reasonably be expected to pay for receiving copyrighted content from the Complainant's platform.

(3) The Respondent claims that his project was never operated as a commercial enterprise. On this, the Panel notes with a view to Annex 7 to the Complaint that the Respondent's website likely was not purely non-commercial in that it displayed an advertisement for a Fairmont hotel with a booking functionality for which the Respondent is likely to have received remuneration. Accordingly, the Respondent also had a commercial interest in the website under the disputed domain name.

In summary, the Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to offer unauthorized access to copyrighted material available only to subscribers of the Complainant's platform. This does not amount to a bona fide offering and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

D. 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, according to his own contentions, positively knew the Complainant. His intention in registering the disputed domain name was to provide a functionality to offer free access to the Complainant's platform so that other Internet users from students to professionals could download content from the Complainant's platform without paying subscription fees, which is the use to which the disputed domain name had then been put. The Respondent's defense to the claim of this being a bad faith registration and use is his claim that he had no knowledge that the functionality he created could be considered to infringe the rights of the Complainant, that he was in good faith that his use was legitimate use and that he offers a sincere apology to the Complainant promising to remove the download tool and place clear non-affiliation disclaimers.

As to registration in bad faith, the Respondent clearly targeted the Complainant by creating the disputed domain name, and therefore the Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant's trademark. This is key to finding for registration in bad faith under the Policy. As to the Respondent's purported believing his registration was not an infringement of the Complainant's rights, ignorance of the law is no defense (known as *ignorantia juris non excusat*) is a widely recognized and foundational legal principle across most major global legal systems, including common law, civil law, and historical traditions. Besides that, the fact that the Respondent used a privacy shield when registering the disputed domain name casts a doubt on the truthfulness on the Respondent's allegation of being unaware his infringing the Complainant's rights.

As to use 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.

The disputed domain name was used to offer unauthorized access to copyrighted material only available to paying subscribers to the Complainant's platform. Panels have held that this constitutes use in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Also on this aspect, the principle applies that – alleged – ignorance of the Respondent of infringing the Complainant's rights by using the disputed domain name to such purpose is no valid defense. The Respondent's apology and promises of adding a disclaimer do not cure bad faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 3.7. Besides that, as outlined under above Section 6.C., the Respondent's asserted lack of commercial interest is hardly credible, also in light of the advertisement on his website.

Finally, the Panel notes that the fact that the Respondent used a privacy shield when registering the disputed domain name casts a doubt on the truthfulness of the Respondent's allegations of being unaware of his infringing the Complainant's rights.

All in all, 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 <freeslidesharedownloader.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2026