

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

reMarkable AS v. Vetle Haugen

Case No. D2025-3688

1. The Parties

The Complainant is reMarkable AS, Norway, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Vetle Haugen, Norway.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <remarkablepaperpro.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Domeneshop AS dba domainnameshop.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 11, 2025. On September 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 15, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (“Redacted for Privacy”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 18, 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 amended Complaint on September 23, 2025.

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 September 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on October 2, 2025. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on October 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on November 3, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant was founded in 2013. It offers tablets for writing, reading, and sketching. Launched in 2020, the Complainant's product reMarkable 2 was named one of Time magazine's "Best Inventions of 2020." By 2022, the Complainant has over one million users around the world. reMarkable Paper Pro is one of the Complainant's products. It is a digital notebook with paper-like writing experience, featuring cloud syncing, handwriting-to-text conversion and integration with services like Google Drive. The Complainant is headquartered in Norway. It operates globally, selling and marketing its products worldwide. The Complainant has online presence via its official website and social media.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for REMARKABLE and REMARKABLE PAPER PRO in different jurisdictions, such as European Union trademark reg. no. 017825291 (Registration Date: July 31, 2018) and Norway trademark registration no. 323951 (Registration Date: October 7, 2022) for REMARKABLE. The Complainant also owns numerous domain names comprising its trademark REMARKABLE, including <remarkable.com> and <remarkable.no>.

The Domain Name was registered on September 4, 2024. The Complainant documents that the Domain Name has resolved to a third-party's website offering competing products (digital planners). The third-party website made direct references to the Complainant's brands and services. The website displayed the Complainant's trademarks REMARKABLE and REMARKABLE PAPER PRO, including visual reproductions of the Complainant's stylized logos. At the time of drafting the Decision, the Domain Name resolves to a webpage that explains the Respondent view on the dispute with the Complainant under the heading "The Chair Doesn't Care".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests the language of the proceeding to be English. When the Complainant became aware of the Domain Name on July 14, 2025, it redirected to a website in English language offering competing products. Shortly after the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter, the Respondent altered the website content to display an open letter in English, proving that the Respondent has knowledge of the English language. Moreover, the Domain Name incorporates the English terms "remarkable", "paper", and "pro". The structure of the Domain Name shows that the Respondent speaks and understands English language. Lastly, the Representative of the Complainant does not have knowledge of the Norwegian language, and therefore, if the Complainant had to translate the Complaint and subsequent communications in Norwegian, such translation would entail significant additional costs for the Complainant and delay the proceedings.

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that the Complainant's trademark enjoys a high degree of renown around the world. The Complainant states that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark REMARKABLE registered prior to the Domain Name, as the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in combination with the terms "paper" and "pro". Furthermore, the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark REMARKABLE PAPER PRO.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use and register its trademark. The use of the Domain Name to redirect Internet users to competing third-party's website cannot be considered as a bona fide offering and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent. It appears for the Complainant that the Respondent deliberately chose the Domain Name to confuse Internet users as to the source of the Domain Name. This is backed by the fact that the Domain Name was registered on September 4, 2024, the day after that the Complainant filed a trademark application for REMARKABLE PAPER PRO.

Most of the Complainant's trademarks predate the Respondent's registration of the Domain Name. A trademark application for REMARKABLE PAPER PRO was filed the day before the Registration of the Domain Name. By conducting a simple search online on popular search engines, the Respondent would have inevitably learnt about the Complainant's trademarks and business. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name to redirect to a third-party website offering products competing with those of the Complainant, is also an indication that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademarks and business at the time of the registration of the Domain Name. It is also evidence of bad faith use. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark REMARKABLE followed by the terms "paper" and "pro", as well as the trademark REMARKABLE PAPER PRO in its entirety. The Complainant argues that the nature of the Domain Name itself evidences bad faith registration and use. Finally, the contents of the Respondent's webpage demonstrate the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and their products and confirms bad faith conduct.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions, but sent an informal email to the Center on October 2, 2025, stating inter alia;

- "The disputed domain was registered on 4 September 2024, one day after Complainant's Norwegian filing for 'Remarkable Paper Pro', and more than a month before that filing became public.
- The domain was used only to point to independent digital-planner products for e-ink tablets, with a visible disclaimer and without any use of Complainant's logos, branding or claims of affiliation.
- There was never an offer made to sell the domain to Complainant, nor any attempt to mislead their customers.
- The domain registration expired on 4 September 2025 and has not been renewed by Respondent.

Assertions of 'bad-faith' registration or use are therefore unsupported by the timeline and by the facts.

A lapse in registration hardly supports the notion of exploitation. Respondent has no interest in continuing the registration".

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural matter - Language of the Proceeding

Paragraph 11(a) of the Rules provides that the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, unless otherwise agreed by the parties. Importantly, paragraph 11(a) also states that the determination of the language of the proceeding is "[...] subject to the authority of the Panel [...], having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding".

The language of the Registration Agreement is Norwegian. The Complainant submitted its Complaint in English and requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Panel notes that the Domain Name consists of the Complainant's trademark, all words in the English language. The Respondent appears to understand English. The Respondent has used the Domain Name to redirect to web pages in the English language. The Center has sent the communication regarding the language of the proceeding to the Respondent in both English and Norwegian, providing the Respondent a fair chance to object. The Respondent has not. On the contrary, he sent an informal email to the Center in English. Based on the above, the Panel cannot see that the choice of English as the language of the proceedings could create an undue burden for any of the Parties.

The Panel determines that the language of this proceeding to be English, see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.

Turning to the merits of the case, in order to prevail, the Complainant must prove the three elements in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademarks REMARKABLE and REMARKABLE PAPER PRO. In this case, the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark REMARKABLE PAPER PRO and the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark REMARKABLE with the addition of "paper" and "pro". The additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark REMARKABLE. For the purpose of assessing under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain; see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is identical to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a 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. 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.

The Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's 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. On the contrary, the Respondent's use is evidence of bad faith, see below.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

On balance of probability, the Respondent knew of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. It follows from the fame of the Complainant in Norway, the composition and the use of the Domain Name, as well as the timing of the Domain Name registration. The use of the Domain Name is clear evidence of bad faith. The Panel finds that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name, which is identical/confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, to drive Internet traffic to the Respondent's

webpage by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. See paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Based on the evidence of the case, the Respondent may also have registered the Domain Name for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor. Neither the Respondent's informal email, nor the current "The Chair Doesn't Care" website at the Domain Name, put forward any plausible good faith reason for the registration of the Domain Name or otherwise refute the bad faith finding in this case.

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 the Domain Name <remarkablepaperpro.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: November 10, 2025