ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. Jakaria Ahmed
Case No. D2026-3444

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jakaria Ahmed, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <slidesharedownloader.app> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (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 5, 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 service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 6, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on August 7, 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 August 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on September 14, 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 in this administrative proceeding is Scribd, Inc., a Delaware corporation. The Complainant affirms that the SLIDESHARE trademarks have been assigned via agreement from the Complainant's legal entity Slideshare, LLC to Scribd, Inc, and that the formal recordal of ownership is still pending in India due to lengthy office processing times. A copy of this agreement, although mentioned by the Complainant, was not attached to the Complaint. However, on the United States Patent and Trademark Office database the Panel has verified the assignment to the Complainant of several SLIDESHARE trademark registrations from SlideShare LLC[1].

The Complainant and its predecessors in interest have used and owned trademark registrations for the SLIDESHARE trademarks in connection with its computer software goods and services since at least as early as 2006 when the Complainant's official website "www.slideshare.net" was first developed and launched.

The Complainant owns several trademarks for SLIDESHARE, including:

- US trademark SLIDESHARE (word) registration No. 4212895 registered on September 25, 2012.

The Complainant has also provided a worldwide SLIDESHARE trademark docket report.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <slideshare.net> created on April 4, 2006.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 27, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which prominently displays the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trademark, and offers Internet users the ability to download copyrighted content from the Complainant's platform without subscribing to the Complainant's services.

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 addition of the term "downloader" does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademarks but rather increases the potential confusion among that Internet users; that the Respondent lacks any trademark rights, domain name rights, or other rights relating to the SLIDESHARE trademark, nor has the Complainant ever authorized the Respondent to use the SLIDESHARE trademarks in connection with any goods or services; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that enables Internet users to download content from the Complainant's platform without a subscription by acting as a proxy and manipulating the URL link, and which creates free access to copyrighted works that would otherwise be accessible only by paying for the

---

[1] Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") section 4.8.

Complainant's services, is an illegal activity that can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent; that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as to provide unauthorized access to materials on a third-party platform, is evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and
(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.

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 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 and 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "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.

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.

Previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to enable Internet users to allegedly download content from the Complainant's platform without a subscription does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus 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.

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

In the present case, the Panel notes that given the contents displayed on the Respondent's website, it is most likely that when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, it was aware of the SLIDESHARE trademark, and intentionally targeted the Complainant by purportedly offering free downloads from the Complainant's platform.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed to enable Internet users to download copyrighted documents from the Complainant's platform for free, amounts to illegitimate activity and thus constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Although the website at the disputed domain name contains a disclaimer indicating the website is not affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant, considering the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the mere existence of such disclaimer does not change the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

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 <slidesharedownloader.app> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/
Fabrizio Bedarida
Sole Panelist
Date: September 21, 2026