

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Goto Technologies USA, LLC v. Domain Admin, Reg.AI  
Case No. DAI2025-0061

### 1. The Parties

Complainant is Goto Technologies USA, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Day Pitney LLP, United States.

Respondent is Domain Admin, Reg.AI, United States, internally represented.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <logmein.ai> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Reg.AI (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 17, 2025. On November 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the .AI Registry a request for registry verification in connection with the Domain Name. On November 19, 2025, the .AI Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

On November 28, 2025, the Center contacted the Registrar, requesting information about the language of registration agreement for the Domain Name. No reply was received, and on December 4, 2025, the Center informed the parties that the Panel will make a final determination on the matter of language of the proceedings.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 25, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on January 1, 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.

On January 8, 2026, Complainant sent the Center an unsolicited Supplemental Filing.

#### **4. Factual Background**

According to the Complaint:

“Complainant is a global provider of software and software-as-a-service (‘SaaS’) for cloud-based tools for remote collaboration and IT management. Indeed, Complainant is one of the world’s top SaaS companies, with offerings that support two (2) million users each day.”

“Complainant owns the well-known LOGMEIN trademark. Since April 2004, Complainant and its predecessors have continuously used the LOGMEIN trademark in connection with software and cloud-based remote work tools for collaboration and IT management (the ‘LOGMEIN Goods and Services’). Today, there are over ten (10) million users of the LOGMEIN product suite, ranging from small businesses to employees at some of the world’s largest companies across a wide variety of industries.”

Complainant has registered the mark LOGMEIN in various jurisdictions including Brazil, Canada, the European Union, India, and Japan. In the United States, Complainant holds Reg. No. 3,093,930 for the mark LOGMEIN, registered on May 16, 2006 in connection with “downloadable computer software for off-site network and personal computer monitoring, administration and management, server analysis”.

Complainant owns the domain name <logmein.com>, which domain name is used to host Complainant’s main commercial website.

Complainant alleges that its LOGMEIN mark is “famous”. According to Complainant:

“LogMeln’s various software offerings have tens (10s) of millions of users, and the LOGMEIN Rescue platform has been used for over one billion remote support sessions. LogMeln was awarded the American Business Award for Software Companies in 2021, and has been featured in multiple prominent technology-focused media outlets, including PC Mag and TechCrunch.”

Complainant annexed to the Complaint various articles purportedly supporting the fame of Complainant’s LOGMEIN suite of products and services. For instance, a May 4, 2021 article from *Globe Newswire* states:

“LogMeln, a leading provider of cloud-based solutions such as GoToConnect, GoToMeeting, LastPass and Rescue that help enable the work-from-anywhere era, today announced that it has been awarded a Gold Stevie® for Company of the Year-Computer Software (large) category from the American Business Awards.”<sup>1</sup>

A July 15, 2025 article in *PC Mag* bears the headline: “LogMeln Pro Review: A Business-Ready Remote Access Solution.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://finance.yahoo.com/news/logmein-wins-gold-stevie-award-130000661.html?guce\\_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xLmNvbS8&guce\\_referrer\\_sig=AQAAAGBr\\_0-7cBJJ\\_tPrewg2x0pWONKk2CeIArjeDclg4qLjwbEhsIFLdySvw0I4ggH0W8pAab740Vb9PQkAAbj9PFIL3YCtawB&guccounter=2](https://finance.yahoo.com/news/logmein-wins-gold-stevie-award-130000661.html?guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAGBr_0-7cBJJ_tPrewg2x0pWONKk2CeIArjeDclg4qLjwbEhsIFLdySvw0I4ggH0W8pAab740Vb9PQkAAbj9PFIL3YCtawB&guccounter=2) and <https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2021/05/04/2222357/11663/en/LogMeIn-Wins-Gold-Stevie-Award-for-Company-of-the-Year-Computer-Software-from-the-2021-American-Business-Awards.html>

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.pcmag.com/reviews/logmein-pro?test\\_uuid=041pBmWGZleS0I0J3epvMrC&test\\_variant=B](https://www.pcmag.com/reviews/logmein-pro?test_uuid=041pBmWGZleS0I0J3epvMrC&test_variant=B)

The Domain Name was registered on May 19, 2019. Respondent claims that he acquired the Domain Name on September 4, 2023.

The Domain Name resolves to a parking page set up by <aftermarket.com>. The web page states that the Domain Name is available for sale at the price of USD 26,999.

According to Respondent, he acquired the Domain Name in September 2023 “for the development of an AI-powered browser automation and authentication tool – a product that Respondent, a software developer, security architect, and former CISO of a global telecommunications company, actively developed with 758 commits to the codebase”. Respondent asserts, “The phrase ‘log me in’ is plainly descriptive of authentication functionality”.

Specifically, Respondent states that he selected the Domain Name because:

- “1. ‘Log me in’ is a descriptive phrase describing the action of authentication – the core functionality Respondent intended to build;
2. Respondent was developing a ‘Startup Studio’ concept with multiple AI-powered products to test for product-market fit;
3. As a startup founder, Respondent was personally familiar with the ‘SSO tax’ problem (the practice of enterprise software vendors charging premium prices for single sign-on functionality);
4. Respondent had ideas around using AI algorithms for browser automation in authentication contexts.”

Respondent asserts that he “invested substantial time and resources developing an enterprise identity management product under the LogMeln.AI brand”. He alleges that, between September 2023 and March 2024, he “began developing Chrome extension prototypes for browser automation and authentication (GitLab repository created September 10, 2023)”, and then began development of a website, as well as an “admin dashboard, browser extension, and documentation”.

Annexed to the Response are documents and screenshots appearing to corroborate Respondent’s alleged efforts to develop its business plan.

Respondent states that he ultimately decided not to launch the product commercially “for reasons entirely unrelated to Complainant’s trademark”. Respondent cites three reasons:

- “1. Security Concerns: As an experienced security professional and former CISO, Respondent understood that launching an authentication product prematurely could result in customer data breaches. Authentication and identity management products handle sensitive credentials and must be ‘extremely solid’ before public launch. This is standard practice in the security industry – responsible developers do not expose users to unnecessary risk by releasing half-baked security tools.
2. Resource Constraints: Building an enterprise security product as a solo founder with minimal support proved too large an undertaking.
3. Professional Obligations: Respondent’s concurrent consulting work, including a demanding technology engagement, required more time and attention.”

According to Respondent, it was in March 2024 – after he decided not to pursue the project – that the Domain Name was redirected to a web page offering the Domain Name for sale.

The Parties exchanged emails on September 30, 2025. Complainant began the exchange by asserting its rights in the LOGMEN mark and claiming that Respondent had registered the Domain Name solely in order to capitalize on Complainant’s mark. Complainant offered to resolve the matter amicably for USD 500, failing which Complainant threatened a UDRP complaint.

Later that day, Respondent replied to Complainant's representative, stating in part:

"Your characterization of the registration as bad faith is incorrect. Logmein.ai was registered for the development of an AI-powered browser automation and authentication tool – a legitimate use where 'log me in' is descriptive terminology for the core functionality. Our client actively developed this business concept through last year before ultimately deciding not to pursue it commercially for reasons unrelated to your client's trademark."

"The assertion that 'LOGMEIN has no other recognized meaning' is factually inaccurate. 'Log me in' is common, generic terminology in computing and web applications, describing the fundamental action of authentication and access. The domain's value lies in its descriptive relevance to AI-powered authentication, browser automation, and access management services – markets distinct from your client's remote desktop software."

Respondent then rejected Complainant's USD 500 offer, and stated that its quoted price of USD 26,999 was a fair price in line with its likely market value.

It does not appear that Respondent attached any supporting documentation to his September 30, 2025 email to corroborate its prior pursuit of a business plan. It appears from the record that the Parties did not communicate with each other after the September 30, 2025 exchange.

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. Complainant maintains that Respondent's professed motive for registering the Domain Name was unsupported and implausible, and that the phrase "log me in" does not enjoy any currency as an accepted phrase. Complainant notes further that Respondent holds numerous domain names with the ".ai" Top-Level Domain ("TLD") and a famous trademark, and Respondent is trying to sell those infringing domain names at improperly elevated prices in order to exploit the value of others' trademarks.

Complainant asserts:

"Respondent has not offered any bona fide goods or services under the Domain or a name corresponding to the Domain. Instead, the Domain resolves to a webpage offering the Domain for sale [...], along with over 530 domains, including other well-known third-party trademarks [...] Respondent has amassed these many hundreds of domains to sell them each, or at least the famous ones, for an exorbitant profit."

Respondent's domain names include <biogen.ai> (offered for sale for USD 36,999), <office365.ai> (USD 16,999), <fortnite.ai> (USD 29,999), and <trustpilot.ai> (USD 29,999).

### **B. Respondent**

Respondent does not deny that it holds a portfolio of domain names and is in the business of domain name transactions. Respondent asserts, though, that it registered the Domain Name without knowledge of Complainant's LOGMEIN mark, and did so because "log me in" is a known phrase associated with the basics of Complainant's business idea. According to Respondent's principal, he spent several months trying to develop the business, and these good faith demonstrable preparations to make a bona fide offering of services constitute a legitimate interest in the Domain Name within the meaning of the Policy.

Respondent asks that the Panel declare Complainant to have engaged in Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH"). According to Respondent: "Complainant's lawyers were informed of this legitimate use before filing this Complaint, yet chose to proceed anyway, mischaracterizing Respondent's detailed explanation as 'implausible justifications.'"

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural issue – Supplemental Filing**

On January 8, 2026, Complainant sent the Center an unsolicited Supplemental Filing. Having reviewed the Supplemental Filing together with the Response, the Panel finds that Complainant's Supplemental Filing addresses the issues that could not have contemplated and addressed in the Complaint, which justifies acceptance in the proceedings. Accepting it moreover does not prejudice Respondent. Therefore, the Panel accepts Complainant's Supplemental Filing.

### **6.2. Substantive issues**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

#### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel concludes that Complainant has rights in the trademark LOGMEIN through registration and use demonstrated in the record. The Panel also concludes that the Domain Name is identical to that mark.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

#### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes, on the record provided, that Complainant has failed to establish that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. There is enough plausible evidence in the record that Respondent registered the Domain Name for its descriptive value ("log me in"). Respondent may overstate the extent to which "log me in" is an accepted phrase, but Complainant's assertion that "log me in" has no currency as an expression and must refer only to Complainant and its registered trademark strikes the Panel as equally unavailing.

Because the ultimate burden of proof rests with Complainant on this issue, the Panel concludes that Complainant has failed to carry that burden.

The Complaint fails.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation", are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel need not decide this element, given its holding above on the "Rights or Legitimate Interests" element.

### **D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at RDNH or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute RDNH. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

On the record presented, the Panel declines to make an RDNH finding against Complainant. At the time the Complaint was filed, Complainant had an established trademark that had enjoyed a measure of renown and which was identical to the Domain Name. Moreover, as far as Complainant was aware, Respondent owned a number of domain names corresponding to well-known trademarks and was offering them for sale at prices high enough to support the suspicion that Respondent was engaged in cybersquatting.

In the Parties' September 30, 2025 email exchange, Respondent articulated his reasons for registering the Domain Name, but did not provide corroborating evidence of his demonstrable preparations to develop his business. Had he done so, the outcome on the RDNH issue might have been different.

In sum, this case does not warrant a finding of RDNH.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Robert A. Badgley/*

**Robert A. Badgley**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 15, 2026