

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LEGO Holding A/S v. Mehmet Bozkus

Case No. D2025-5244

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Mehmet Bozkus, Türkiye.

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

The disputed domain name <legociti.com> is registered with IHS Telekom, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 16, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 17, 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 (GDPR Masked) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 17, 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 December 19, 2025.

On December 17, 2025 the Center informed the parties in Turkish and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Turkish. On December 19, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 January 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Ugur G. Yalçiner as the sole panelist in this matter on February 2, 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.

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

The Complainant, LEGO Holding A/S, is a Danish company, founded in 1932, engaged in the design, manufacture and commercialization of LEGO-branded construction toys and related products. As of January 1, 2025, LEGO Juris A/S was renamed LEGO Holding A/S to unify LEGO-branded activities and the related intellectual property rights under one entity. The LEGO Group operates internationally through subsidiaries, branches and authorized licensees, with sales offices, manufacturing sites and retail stores worldwide, and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including Türkiye.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations consisting of the term LEGO, some of which are listed below:

- International trademark LEGO with registration No. 287932, registered on August 27, 1964 in class 28,
- United States trademark LEGO with registration No. 1018875, registered on August 26, 1975 in class 28,
- International trademark registration LEGO with registration No. 869258, registered on November 11, 2005, designating, amongst others, Türkiye (where the Respondent resides) in classes 9, 16, 25, 28 and 41,
- Turkish trademark registration LEGO with registration No. 119057, registered on August 2, 1990 in classes 9, 16, 20, 24, 25 and 28.

The Complainant is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark. The Complainant also owns the domain name <lego.com>, which was registered on August 2, 1995 and resolves to "www.lego.com", where the Complainant maintains an extensive online presence.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 5, 2025, and it resolves to a parking page displaying "related searches" or pay-per-click links referring to the Complainant's trademark and its field of activity.

#### **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. The Complaint includes the following contentions:

(i) Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant contends that the dominant element of the disputed domain name is the term “LEGO”, which is identical to its registered LEGO trademark protected in numerous countries. The Complainant maintains that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark, as recognized in prior UDRP decisions, and that the addition of the suffix “citi” does not prevent such similarity but rather reinforces it, particularly since the Complainant offers brick toys under the name LEGO CITY. The Complainant further states that the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) is irrelevant for the comparison. In the Complainant’s view, Internet users are likely to assume an association with the Complainant, and the Respondent’s use of LEGO as the dominant part of the disputed domain name takes unfair advantage of the goodwill attached to the LEGO mark.

(ii) Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent holds no registered trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it, and has not been authorized or licensed to use the LEGO mark. The Complainant further states that the Respondent is not an authorized dealer and has no business relationship with the Complainant, nor does the website contain any disclaimer of affiliation. The Complainant also notes that the Respondent previously used a privacy Whois service, which past panels have considered indicative of a lack of legitimate interest. In addition, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is not being used for any bona fide offering of goods or services, but instead resolves to a commercial parking page with sponsored links and has been offered for sale on aftermarket platforms such as Sedo. The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily to profit from the value and goodwill of the LEGO trademark.

(iii) Registration and Use in Bad Faith

The Complainant contends that the LEGO trademark is a well-known and reputable mark with substantial goodwill worldwide, which has made it a frequent target of domain name infringers. The Complainant states that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 5, 2025, long after the Complainant’s LEGO trademark registrations in Türkiye and elsewhere, and that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant’s rights. The Complainant further submits that it attempted to resolve the matter amicably by sending cease-and-desist letters requesting voluntary transfer, but received no response. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is connected to a website displaying sponsored links and is being offered for sale on Sedo, which evidences bad faith under paragraphs 4(b)(iv) and 4(b)(i) of the Policy. The Complainant also maintains that bad faith is not excluded even if the links were automatically generated or if the Respondent did not himself obtain revenue from the parking page. In addition, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of cybersquatting through registrations of other domain names incorporating well-known trademarks, has previously been involved in an adverse UDRP decision, and used a privacy service and false Whois details, which further supports a finding of bad faith registration and use.

**B. Respondent**

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

**6. Discussion and Findings**

**6.1. Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Turkish. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that it is unable to communicate in Turkish and that translation of the Complaint would impose an undue burden, additional costs, and delay the proceedings. The Complainant further pointed out that the disputed domain name consists of Latin characters, that the website at the disputed domain name was entirely in English, and that the Respondent appears to understand English, as reflected in the Respondent's portfolio of domain names incorporating English dictionary terms.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

## **6.2. Substantive Proceedings**

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three elements are present:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have 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.

### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is the owner of the trademarks LEGO registered in several jurisdictions.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark LEGO in its entirety, along with the additional term "citi". In this regard, the Panel considers that the mere addition of the term "citi", which is evocative of the Complainant's LEGO CITY range of brick toys, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademarks, as the Complainant's LEGO trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is an accepted principle that gTLDs, in this case ".com", are to be typically disregarded in the consideration of the issue of whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark.

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks and that the requirements in paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy are fulfilled.

## **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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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 notes that the Respondent does not have any registered trademark or trade name and no license or authorization of any other kind has been given to the Respondent by the Complainant to use its registered trademarks.

The Panel also notes that there is no evidence of the Respondent’s demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name, or a name corresponding to it, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying “related searches” or pay-per-click links referring to the Complainant’s trademark and its field of activity. In addition, according to the Complainant’s assertion and Annex 12 to the Complaint, the disputed domain name has been offered for sale on the domain name aftermarket platform Sedo. The Panel considers that the use of a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trademark to host a parking page with such search terms, and the offering of the domain name for sale, does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case.

As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy are therefore fulfilled by the Complainant.

## **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.

In the present case, the Panel is satisfied with the relevant evidence filed by the Complainant showing that it owns trademark rights for LEGO, which have been registered and used for many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel is of the opinion that it is implausible for the Respondent to have been unaware of the Complainant and its well-known LEGO trademark at the time the disputed domain name was registered. As the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s LEGO trademark and is evocative of the Complainant’s LEGO CITY range of brick toys, it carries the impression that the disputed domain name is owned or authorized by the Complainant. Several UDRP panels have held that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself give rise to a presumption of bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

Considering that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying “related searches” or pay-per-click links referring to the Complainant’s trademark and its field of activity, and that it has also been offered for sale on a domain name aftermarket platform, the Panel considers that the Respondent’s registration of a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s LEGO trademark was likely intended to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The use of the disputed domain name in this manner supports a finding that the Respondent has sought to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark for commercial gain.

The Panel also considers that, as evidenced by the Complainant, the Respondent has registered several domain names confusingly similar to well-known trademarks and has previously been involved in a UDRP case in which bad faith was found. This demonstrates that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations, which is a further indicator of bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2).

The Complainant alleges that it had sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on September 19, 2025, before filing the Complaint, but the Respondent has not responded to that letter. Referring to the Panel’s consideration in *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG v. (This Domain is For Sale) Joshuathan Investments, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0787](#), and considering the reasons above, the Panel is of the opinion that the failure to reply to the Complainant’s letter and to the Complaint further supports the Panel’s finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

Having considered all the facts in this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has sustained its burden of proof in showing that the disputed domain name 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 <legociti.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Ugur G. Yalçiner/*

**Ugur G. Yalçiner**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2026