

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LEGO Holding A/S v. Erich Rommel, Rommel GmbH Malerarbeiten  
Case No. D2026-0603

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Erich Rommel, Rommel GmbH Malerarbeiten, Germany.

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

The disputed domain name <lego-milano.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 February 12, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 13, 2026, 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 0176921351) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 16, 2026, 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 February 19, 2026.

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 February 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Igor Alfiorov as the sole panelist in this matter on March 17, 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 is a Danish company and part of the LEGO Group, a globally recognized manufacturer of LEGO-branded construction toys and related products. Founded in 1932, the LEGO Group is a worldwide enterprise with extensive operations, including multiple manufacturing sites, sales offices, and retail stores across the globe. LEGO products are currently sold in more than 130 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for the LEGO mark, which predate the registration of the disputed domain name, including the Canadian trademark for LEGO, registration number TMA106457, registered on April 26, 1957, in classes 7, 9, 12, 16, 20, and 28 and European Union registration number 2829463 for LEGO (figurative), registered on January 7, 2004, in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 38, 41, and 43.

The LEGO trademark is widely recognized as one of the most famous trademarks globally, supported by decades of extensive advertising and promotion. The mark has consistently ranked among the most reputable global brands and has received numerous awards and recognitions, including being named among the most reputable companies worldwide.

The Complainant also owns a large portfolio of domain names incorporating its LEGO trademark, including its primary domain name <lego.com>, which resolves to its official website used to promote its products and services globally.

The disputed domain name <lego-milano.com> was registered on December 15, 2025, and previously resolved to a website purportedly offering LEGO-branded products for sale. The website prominently displayed the Complainant's LEGO trademark and logo. Following takedown actions initiated by the Complainant, the disputed domain name now resolves to a blank Shopify page.

#### **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.

First, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known LEGO trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the LEGO mark in its entirety, which constitutes the dominant and distinctive element. The addition of the term "milano" does not avoid confusing similarity but rather, it reinforces it, as it may refer either to a LEGO product (the "Milano" spaceship model) or to the location of the Complainant's flagship store in Milan, Italy. The inclusion of a hyphen and the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain does not affect the overall assessment of similarity.

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been licensed or authorized to use the LEGO trademark, and is not an authorized reseller or distributor of LEGO products. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, as confirmed by the Whois records and website content.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent's use of a privacy service, combined with the absence of any legitimate explanation for the use of the LEGO mark, supports the conclusion that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests.

Moreover, the Respondent does not meet the requirements established under the "Oki Data" test as the use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent operated an unauthorized commercial website offering LEGO products, prominently displaying the Complainant's logo without consent, and failing to include any disclaimer regarding the absence of affiliation.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The LEGO trademark is globally famous, and the Respondent could not plausibly have been unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Respondent intentionally registered the disputed domain name to exploit the goodwill associated with the LEGO mark.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, through the operation of an unauthorized website selling LEGO products and displaying the LEGO logo.

Even after the website was taken down, the passive holding of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith, given the well-known nature of the LEGO mark, the lack of any plausible legitimate use, and the Respondent's prior conduct.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the LEGO trademark for the purpose of the Policy through extensive trademark registrations worldwide and longstanding use.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the LEGO mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

The addition of the term "milano" and inclusion of a hyphen does not affect the overall assessment of similarity. The Panel finds the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Moreover, the ".com" suffix is technically required and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has therefore 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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, in particular:

- The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the LEGO trademark in any manner;
- There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name; and
- The Respondent has not demonstrated any trademark rights or other legitimate interests in the term “lego”.

The evidence further shows that the Respondent previously used the disputed domain name to operate an unauthorized commercial website purportedly offering LEGO products while prominently displaying the Complainant’s trademark and logo. Moreover, the Respondent fails to meet the requirements of the “Ok! Data” test. The website did not accurately disclose the lack of relationship with the Complainant and instead created the false impression of affiliation or authorization. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In addition, the nature of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s trademark together with a geographical term, carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

## **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 notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as set out in 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the record, the Panel finds that Complainant has a well-established reputation in the LEGO mark, which had been used for many decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. It is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's famous trademark. The incorporation of the LEGO trademark in its entirety, absent any plausible explanation, supports a finding of bad faith registration.

Provided evidence shows that the Respondent previously used the disputed domain name for an unauthorized website purportedly offering LEGO products while displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo without any disclaimer, thereby falsely presenting itself as an official or authorized LEGO store. Such conduct constitutes passing off and intentional deception for commercial gain. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including impersonation and passing off, is evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel further notes that the current inactivity of the disputed domain name after the Complainant's takedown request does not prevent a finding of bad faith. Panels have recognized that passive holding may constitute bad faith where, as here, the mark is well known, the disputed domain name incorporates it in its entirety, and the Respondent previously used it for an infringing website ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3). In these circumstances, the Respondent's passive holding constitutes bad faith.

Further, the use of privacy services supports the inference of bad faith.

Accordingly, 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 <lego-milano.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Igor Alfiorov/*

**Igor Alfiorov**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 31, 2026