

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc.
Case No. D2025-2606

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LEGO Holding A/S, Denmark, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc., Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legotechnik.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Silver Domain Names LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2025. On July 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 3, 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 (Statutory Masking Enabled) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 8, 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 July 10, 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 July 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Yuzo Wada as the sole panelist in this matter on August 7, 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 by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company organized under the laws of Denmark that is the worldwide well-known producer of LEGO branded construction toys and related LEGO products. Further to its traditional LEGO products, the Complainant has also created more specialized products such as its product line LEGO TECHNIC.

The Complainant is the owner of the LEGO trademark, and all other trademarks registered in many jurisdictions around the world (including in Cyprus, where the Respondent is located), such as:

- the United States of America (“US”) trademark for LEGO, Reg. No. 1018875, registered on August 26, 1975, in International Class 28;
- the US trademark for LEGO, Reg. No. 1248936, registered on August 23, 1983, in International Classes 16, 20, 22, and 25;
- the Cyprus trademark for LEGO, Reg. No. 23813, registered on March 27, 1984, in International Class 3;
- the US trademark for LEGO TECHNIC, Reg. No. 1971387, registered on April 30, 1996, in International Class 28.

In addition, several prior UDRP decisions recognized the distinctive and well-known nature of the Complainant’s LEGO trademark (including, *LEGO Juris A/S v. Level 5 Corp.*, [WIPO Case No. D2008-1692](#); *LEGO Juris A/S v. Michael Longo*, [WIPO Case No. D2008-1715](#); *LEGO Juris A/S v. Paul Clark*, [WIPO Case No. D2024-0383](#)).

The Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including sales offices, manufacturing sites, and many retail stores. The Complainant employs many individuals, and LEGO products are sold all over the world, including in Cyprus.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 29, 2021. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a parking page displaying pay-per-click (“PPC”) sponsored links. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name was also listed for sale at a price of USD 588.

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 the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LEGO trademark.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent lacks any rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain a decision that a domain name should be either cancelled or transferred:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(ii) the 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

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 a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

The Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in the mark LEGO. The Panel further finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to this mark, since the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's famous trademarks. The mere addition of the generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com" to the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, neither does the addition of the term "technik" to the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark LEGO TECHNIC. The only difference between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark LEGO TECHNIC is the purposeful misspelling of LEGO TECHNIC. The Disputed Domain Name is misspelled by substituting the letter "k" for the letter "c". This conduct, commonly referred to as "typosquatting", creates a confusingly similar Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant's trademark under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See, e.g., *Wachovia Corporation v. Peter Carrington*, [WIPO Case No. D2002-0775](#); [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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, inter alia, due to the fact that the Complainant has not given its consent for the Respondent to use its trademarks. 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.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be evidence of the registration and use in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) you have 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 you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other online 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.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered decades after the Complainant first acquired rights in the LEGO and LEGO TECHNIC trademarks. Without the authorization from the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website displaying sponsored links.

Performing searches on the Google search engine for the terms "Lego Technik" not only returns multiple links referencing the Complainant and its business, but suggest that the search query was intended to be "Lego Technic". Given the Complainant's worldwide reputation and presence on the Internet, the Respondent was or should have been aware of the mark LEGO TECHNIC prior to registering the Disputed Domain Name (see *Caesar World, Inc. v. Forum LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0517](#)).

The Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the Complainant's trademark LEGO is extremely well known internationally. The incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by a registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith (*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#); *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#)).

The Panel finds that Internet users are likely to be misled by the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademarks into supposing that the Disputed Domain Name indicates a site belonging to, or authorized by, the Complainant. The only rational reason for using such a domain name would be to attract some of the Complainant's customers to the Respondent's site with competing sponsored links. This falls squarely within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy (*Inter Ikea Systems B.V. v. Daniel Woodson*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1933](#)).

Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name has been advertised as being for sale for USD 588, which further suggests targeting of the Complainant. The Panel cannot find any justification for the registration and use of the typosquatting Disputed Domain Name in such circumstances except to find that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of selling the Disputed Domain Name for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs. That constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1).

In light of the above, the Panel concludes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used by the Respondent with the intent of selling the Disputed Domain Name for profit and/or to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to the resulting website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as described under paragraphs 4(b)(i) and 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Noting that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates a widely-known trademark, that no response has been filed, and that there appears to be no conceivable good faith use that could be made by the Respondent of the Disputed Domain Name, and considering all the facts and evidence, the Panel therefore finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy are also fulfilled in this case.

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 <legotechnik.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuzo Wada/

Yuzo Wada

Sole Panelist

Date: August 21, 2025