

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Scribd, Inc. v. Tahseen Kiani
Case No. DCO2025-0102

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Tahseen Kiani, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <slidesdownloader.co> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 19, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 22, 2025, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 26, 2025, 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 December 30, 2025.

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 January 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on January 29, 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, Scribd, Inc., is a Delaware corporation. The Complainant asserts that it owns 14 trademark registrations for SLIDESHARE in different jurisdictions worldwide for use in connection with a variety of reporting, computer, electronic, and software-related goods and services. The Complainant also states that since 2006, it has had over 28,000,000 uploads in 40 content categories and serves over 80,000,000 professionals per month.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

- the US trademark registration No. 4212895 for SLIDESHARE, registered on September 25, 2012, in classes 9, 35, and 42; and
- the European Union trademark registration No. 010853919 for SLIDESHARE, registered on November 26, 2012, in class 35.

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

The disputed domain name was registered on August 20, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint and this Decision, it resolves to an active website “slidesdownloader.app”, where the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE trademark is prominently displayed. This website appears to provide Internet users with the ability to download content from the Complainant’s platform without subscribing to the Complainant’s services. For example, this website displays the following content: “SlidesDownloader.co is a great & free Slideshare downloader tool used to download slides from Slideshare in PDF and PPT format. [...] Go to slideshare website, pick your slides, copy the URL from the searchbar at the top. Paste SlideShare URL [...]”

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’s contentions regarding the three elements under the Policy are summarized below.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s SLIDESHARE trademark.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant particularly asserts that the website the disputed domain name points to provides Internet users with the ability to download copyrighted content from the Complainant’s platform without subscribing to the Complainant’s services by acting as a proxy and manipulating the URL link. The same website prominently displays the Complainant’s trademark and provides instructions for extracting copyrighted content from the Complainant’s platform that would only be accessible in full by subscribing to the Complainant’s services.

Third, considering, in particular, the date of registration of the disputed domain name and the use made of it, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the dominant and recognizable element "slides" of the SLIDESHARE trademark. Therefore, the Panel finds the 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, the "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 3.0](#), 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 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 3.0](#), 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. By failing to submit a Response, 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that enables Internet users to bypass the subscription requirements of the Complainant's platform and to download copyrighted materials from it without authorization or compensation. By doing so, the Respondent also acts with the objective of targeting the Complainant's trademark and disrupting its business activities. In the Panel's view, this amounts to illegitimate activity.

Accordingly, 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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel considers the registration dates of the Complainant's domain name and trademark, the registration date of the disputed domain name, the use of the disputed domain name described above, and the Panel finds it evident that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark and services at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, in particular, the use of the disputed domain name explained above, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Under the circumstances of the present case, the Panel considers the Respondent's failure to submit a response as a further element supporting the finding of bad faith registration and use.

Based on the available record, 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 <slidesdownloader.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu/

Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu

Sole Panelist

Date: February 12, 2026