

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LEGO Holding A/S v. Mystery Lego, Lego Mystery Box  
Case No. D2025-3963

### **1. The Parties**

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

Respondent is Mystery Lego, Lego Mystery Box, India.

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

The disputed domain name <legomysterybox.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (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 disputed domain name. On September 30, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175138875) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 1, 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 2, 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 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 23, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez as the sole panelist in this matter on October 29, 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

LEGO Holding A/S, based in Denmark, founded in 1932, has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including: five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores, is the owner of the LEGO trademark, and all other trademarks used in connection with the famous LEGO brands of construction toys and other LEGO branded products.

Complainant owns a large portfolio of trademarks including the word LEGO in several jurisdictions, such as:

- Denmark trademark LEGO No. VR 2024 01171, dated April 12, 2024, duly renewed and covering goods and services in classes 9, 28, 35, 41;
- Canada trademark LEGO No. TMA106457, dated April 26, 1957, duly renewed and covering services in classes 7, 9, 12, 16, 20, 28;
- India trademark LEGO No. 240430, dated February 7, 1967, duly renewed and covering goods in class 28

The Complaint attaches a list of the LEGO trademark registered in more than 40 countries and evidence that the LEGO brand is well known. LEGO trademark is among the best-known trademarks in the world, due in part to decades of extensive advertising, which prominently depicts the LEGO mark on all products, packaging, displays, advertising, and promotional materials

The Complainant's trademarks were registered prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name <legomysterybox.com> was registered on June 3, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which offers Complainant's products.

#### 5. Parties' Contentions

##### A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark LEGO.

Complainant is well-known throughout the world, including India where Respondent is located. In this regard, many panels have previously acknowledged Complainant's reputation worldwide, making it unlikely that Respondent was not aware of Complainant's rights in the LEGO trademark.

The considerable value and goodwill associated with the mark LEGO is most certainly what motivated Respondent to register the disputed domain name.

Complainant claims it produces, markets, and sells products in the name of "mysterybox" and that Complainant's "LEGO Star Wars Mystery Box" product is listed on Complainant's primary website. The addition of the words "mystery box", is not sufficient to avoid the likelihood of confusion. It is well-established that "a domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant's registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the UDRP". (*Groupe Auchan v. Gan Yu*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0188](#); *LEGO Juris A/S v. DomainPark Ltd, David Smith, Above.com Domain Privacy, Transure Enterprise Ltd, Host master*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0138](#)).

Complainant further contends that Respondent has no rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that it has been registered and used in bad faith.

Complainant's LEGO trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

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

Complainant states that the disputed domain name <legomysterybox.com> is confusingly similar to its trademark LEGO. Indeed, the disputed domain name includes Complainant's trademark in its entirety.

The addition of the terms "mystery box" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. It is well-established that a domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant's registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the UDRP.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has not been established.

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

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

Firstly, Complainant is well-known throughout the world, including India where Respondent is located. In this regard, many panels have previously acknowledged Complainant's reputation worldwide, making it unlikely that Respondent was not aware of Complainant's rights in the LEGO trademark (*LEGO Juris A/S v. My Store Admin, Wrangler Bags*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2560](#)).

Secondly, considering the composition of the disputed domain name entirely reproduces Complainant's trademark LEGO associated to the word "Mysterybox", it is unlikely that Respondent did not have Complainant's trademark and company name in mind while registering the disputed domain name.

Therefore, Respondent most likely registered the disputed domain name <legomysterybox.com> based on the notoriety and attractiveness of Complainant's trademark to divert Internet users to its website for commercial gain. Hence, it is implausible that Respondent did not have Complainant's trademark in mind at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

Consequently, in view of the abovementioned circumstances, the second element of the Policy has been established.

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

Some elements may be put forward to support the finding that Respondent also registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Previous panels have considered that in the absence of any license or permission from Complainant to use such widely known trademark, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the domain name could reasonably be claimed (*Alstom, Bouygues v. Webmaster*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0281](#); *Guerlain S.A. v. Peikang*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0055](#)).

As the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark, previous panels have ruled that "a likelihood of confusion is presumed, and such confusion will inevitably result in the diversion of Internet traffic from Complainant's site to Respondent's site" (*MasterCard International Incorporated ("MasterCard") v. Wavepass AS*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1765](#); *Edmunds.com, Inc. v. Triple E Holdings Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-1095](#)).

The disputed domain name demonstrates Respondent's intention to abusively benefit from Complainant's reputation, and particularly its trademarks, to obtain undue commercial benefits, either by offering products like the Complainant's or by occupying the site to gain an unfair advantage over Complainant.

Therefore, the disputed domain name <legomysterybox.com> was registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **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 <legomysterybox.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez /

**Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 14, 2025