

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC

Case No. D2026-3447

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <slidesaver.app> is registered with Tucows Domains 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 4, 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 (Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 7, 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 August 12, 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 August 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 the proprietor of trademark registrations in many countries across the world for SLIDESHARE, in connection with a variety of computer, electronic, and software related goods and services. It owns, inter alia, the following trade mark registrations:

- U.S. Registration No. 4212895, registered on September 25, 2012;
- Canadian Registration No. TMA896040, registered on February 9, 2015; and
- European Union Registration No. 010853919, registered on November 26, 2012.

The Complainant and its predecessors have used the SLIDESHARE mark since at least as early as 2006.

The Complainant owns and operates the domain name <slideshare.net>, which was registered on April 4, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 18, 2024. It resolves to a webpage where the Complainant's SLIDESHARE mark is prominently displayed. The webpage is advertised as a "Slideshare Downloader" and offers a tool to access and download materials from the Complainant's platform without a subscription.

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.

The Complainant contends as follows:

- 1) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SLIDESHARE trade mark as it incorporates the nearly identical dominant and recognizable first term "Slide". The additional term "saver" in the disputed domain name does not distinguish it from the Complainant's mark because it is descriptive and increases the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SLIDESHARE mark. The disputed domain name is used to allow users to fraudulently and illegally download copyrighted works and materials from the Complainant's platform bearing the SLIDESHARE mark.
- 2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered well after the date the SLIDESHARE trade mark was first used and/or registered. The Respondent's webpage states, inter alia, that "SlideShare has many resources like presentations, infographics, documents, and videos used by professionals and educators. But it's hard to access these materials offline for study or sharing without internet. SlideShare Downloader lets you download and save these resources to your device". The header of the webpage also displays a logo which the Complainant uses. Such use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence that the Respondent has any trade mark rights in relation to the SLIDESHARE trade mark; the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use any of its trade marks; and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "Slidesaver" or "Slidesaver.app".

3) The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant and its predecessors have continuously used the SLIDESARE mark since at least as early as 2006, when the Complainant's predecessor-in-interest first acquired the domain name <slideshare.net>. The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant's common law use rights and registration of the SLIDESHARE mark. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to advertise to its users that it offers the ability to avoid signing up for the Complainant's services by acting as a proxy and allowing for the free download of copyright-protected documents. There are direct references to Slideshare on the Respondent's website as well as its logo, which makes it clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for illegal activity constitutes bad faith, as is its use to intentionally direct Internet traffic away from the Complainant and the services it offers.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SLIDESHARE mark as alleged by the Complainant.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7, states that "in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark".

The Panel agrees that the dominant feature of the Complainant's 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. The Panel further notes that the Complainant's SLIDESHARE mark is prominently displayed on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, and that the website has been used to offer a tool enabling users to access and download materials from the Complainant's platform without a subscription. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is seeking to target the Complainant and its mark through the disputed domain name, which further confirms the finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.15.

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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent owns any trademark rights in the terms "Slidesaver" or "Slidesaver.app". Further, the circumstances of this case do not indicate that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers. The disputed domain name resolves to a website advertised as a "Slideshare Downloader" and offers a tool to access and download materials from the Complainant's platform without a subscription. The Panel considers that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to facilitate unauthorized access to the Complainant's platform without a subscription, and downloading of, third-party proprietary and/or copyright-protected material cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed 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.

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 finds that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith, and the circumstances contemplated by paragraph 4(b)(iv) are present:

"(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location".

In addition, UDRP panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name in connection with illegal activity may constitute evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. In the circumstances of this case, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to facilitate unrestricted copyright infringement constitutes further compelling evidence of bad faith.

Moreover, the Respondent was found to have acted in bad faith by the panel in a prior proceeding (*Scribd, Inc. v. Host Master, Njalla Oka LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1729](#)) brought by the Complainant. That finding further supports the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith in the present case under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record as a whole, the Panel finds the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

Accordingly, 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 <slidesaver.app> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/

Francine Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2026