

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Franck Jeannin
Case No. D2025-3962

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Franck Jeannin, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lego.photo> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Gandi SAS (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 29, 2025. On September 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On October 1, 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 Complainant on October 4, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 7, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 30, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan as the sole panelist in this matter on November 11, 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

According to the information provided in the Complaint, Complainant is the owner of the LEGO trademark, and all other trademarks used in connection with the LEGO brands of construction toys and other LEGO branded products. Over the years, the business of making and selling LEGO branded toys has grown remarkably. Founded in 1932, Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including: five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores. Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in France where Respondent is located.

According to the evidence submitted, Complainant owns numerous registrations for the trademark LEGO including European Union Trademark No. 000039800, registration date October 5, 1998. In addition, Complainant also owns a portfolio of 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark

The Domain Name was registered on March 30, 2025. The Domain Name does not resolve to an active website.

The trademark registrations of Complainant were issued prior to the registration of the Domain Name.

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.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark LEGO as the dominant part of the Domain Name comprises the term "LEGO", identical to the registered trademark LEGO.

According to Complainant, Respondent has no rights nor any legitimate interest in the Domain Name. Complainant submits that there is no evidence which suggests that Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name. No license or authorization of any other kind has been given by Complainant to Respondent to use the trademark LEGO. Complainant asserts that LEGO is a famous trademark and any use of such a trademark in a domain name would violate the rights of the trademark. Respondent is not using the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has intentionally chosen the Domain Name based on a registered trademark to redirect Internet users to a website that resolves to a landing page and lacks content. Respondent has failed to make use of the Domain Name's website and has not demonstrated any attempt to make legitimate use of the Domain Name and website, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Complainant asserts that Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. According to Complainant the LEGO trademark in respect of toys has the status of a well-known and reputed trademark with a substantial and widespread reputation throughout the whole European Union and throughout the world. The awareness of the trademark LEGO is considered to be significant and substantial. Complainant submits that it is obvious that it is the fame of the trademark that has motivated Respondent to register the Domain Name. Respondent cannot claim to have been using the trademark LEGO without being aware of Complainant's rights to it. The Domain Name is connected to an inactive site and is not being used.

Complainant submits that past panels have noted that bad faith use does not require a positive act on the part of Respondent, and that passively holding a domain name can constitute a factor in finding bad faith registration and use pursuant to the Policy.

Complainant concludes that LEGO is a famous trademark worldwide. It is clear that Respondent was aware of the rights Complainant has in the trademark and the value of said trademark at the time of registration. There is no connection between Respondent and Complainant. By passively holding the Domain Name Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

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

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in this proceeding.

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.

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 entirety of the LEGO mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".photo" is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use any of its LEGO trademarks or to register the Domain Name incorporating its trademarks. Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert Internet users or to tarnish the trademarks of Complainant. Based on the undisputed submission and evidence provided by Complainant, the Domain Name does not resolve to an active website. The Panel does not consider such non-use a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. There is also no evidence that Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name nor that Respondent has acquired any trademark or service mark rights.

Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the 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

The Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Noting the well-known status of the LEGO trademark and the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it is more likely than not that Respondent knew or in any event should have known of Complainant’s LEGO mark. This is also suggested by Respondent’s choice of the Domain Name, namely one which includes the entirety of Complainant’s LEGO mark.

The Panel notes that the Domain Name does not resolve to an active website. It is well established that non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith use under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Noting (i) the degree of distinctiveness and reputation of Complainant’s LEGO marks, (ii) the failure of Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated bona fide use, and (iii) the implausibility of any bona fide use to which the inherently misleading Domain Name may be put, the Panel finds that Respondent possibly registered the Domain Name with the intention to unfairly attract Internet users to its Domain Name.

The Panel finds that Complainant has proven that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Name, <lego.photo>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan/

Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan

Sole Panelist

Date: November 19, 2025