

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Scribd, Inc. v. Abhinav Chauhan  
Case No. DCO2026-0040

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Abhinav Chauhan, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <scribd-downloader.co> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 23, 2026. On April 24, 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 (Porkbun LLC (Registrar)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 27, 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 the same date.

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 April 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Louis-Bernard Buchman as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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, a corporation incorporated in the State of Delaware, United States, offers for sale subscription-based computer, electronic and software-related goods and services, which may be purchased online at its official website <scribd.com>.

The Complainant has registered close to 50 trademarks for SCRIBD, including inter alia the United States trademark registration No. 3777227, registered on April 20, 2010, and the European Union trademark registration No. 1422028, registered on July 11, 2018 (together hereinafter referred to as the “Mark”).

In addition, the Complainant owns and operates the <scribd.com> domain name, registered on September 24, 2006, which resolves to its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 30, 2024, and resolved at the time the Complaint was filed to a website displaying the Mark and offering to avoid the subscription obligation to access the contents of the Complainant’s official website. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name still resolves to a website displaying the Mark and offering to avoid the subscription obligation to access the contents of the Complainant’s official website.

#### **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:

- (i) the disputed domain name reproduces the Mark, in which it has rights, and is confusingly similar to the Mark insofar as the disputed domain name contains the Mark in its entirety and that the addition of the term “downloader” after the Mark is not capable of dispelling the confusing similarity;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant never authorized the Respondent to use the Mark in any manner and the Respondent never had any affiliation with the Complainant;
- (iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, with knowledge of the Mark when registering it, and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, for commercial gain.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **6.1. Procedural Aspects – Failure to Respond**

As aforementioned, no Response was received from the Respondent.

Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a default by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint.

The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstance in this case which would cause the Panel to proceed differently.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, it is the Complainant's burden to establish that all three of the required criteria for a transfer of the disputed domain name have been met, even in the event of a default.

Under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel is empowered to draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate under the circumstances.

In this case, the Panel finds that, as a result of the default, the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant. In particular, by defaulting and failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, as discussed below, the Respondent has failed to provide any information or reasoning that might have led the Panel to question the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted in bad faith.

## **6.2. Requirements of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy**

### **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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds that the Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, despite the Mark being followed by a hyphen and the word "downloader".

While the addition of another term here, such as the word "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.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Regarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".co" in the disputed domain name, it is well established that a TLD does not generally affect the assessment of a domain name for the purpose of determining identity or confusingly similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here claimed unauthorized account access/hacking) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used 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 Complainant provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Mark and offering to avoid the subscription obligation to access the contents of the Complainant's official website. Prior panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here claimed unauthorized account access/hacking) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

In addition, some UDRP panels have held that in certain circumstances, registrants of domain names have a duty to abstain from registering and using a domain name, which is either identical or confusingly similar to a prior trademark held by others, and which would infringe upon or otherwise violate the rights of a third party. See Policy, paragraph 2(b); *Nike, Inc. v. B. B. de Boer*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1397](#); *Nuplex Industries Limited v. Nuplex*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0078](#); *Mobile Communication Service Inc. v. WebReg, RN*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1304](#); *BOUYGUES v. Chengzhang, Lu Ciagao*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1325](#); *Media General Communications, Inc. v. Rarenames, WebReg*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0964](#); and *mVisible Technologies, Inc. v. Navigation Catalyst Systems, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1141](#).

In this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent clearly failed to abide by such duty.

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 <scribd-downloader.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Louis-Bernard Buchman/*  
**Louis-Bernard Buchman**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: May 25, 2026