

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Amen 01, Fercus
Case No. D2026-0752

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Amen 01, Fercus, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legofun.store> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 23, 2026. On February 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On February 23, 2026, 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 the Complainant on February 25, 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 25, 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 March 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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 member of the Lego Group, the world-famous Danish toy production company founded in 1932 that manufactures LEGO branded toys, consisting mostly of interlocking plastic bricks or blocks. The Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including: five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals, and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in the United States.

The Complainant and other members of the Lego Group are the proprietors of numerous trademark registrations for LEGO (the "Mark") around the world, including Denmark trademark number VR 1954 00604 registered on May 1, 1954; United States trademark number 1248936 registered on August 23, 1983; and International trademark number 287932 registered on August 27, 1964. It is also the owner of over 6,000 domain names containing the term LEGO, including in particular <lego.com>, and <lego.co.uk>.

The Domain Name was registered on October 23, 2025. It does not currently resolve to an active website, but the Complainant has adduced evidence that at the time of preparing the Complaint the Domain Name resolved to a website headed "LegoFun", featuring images of the Complainant's products and purporting to offer for sale a wide range of LEGO products.

The Respondent did not reply to cease and desist letters sent by a representative of the Complainant in November 2025.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its LEGO mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (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 the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".store", the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the term "fun". The Panel finds that the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but for a website prominently featuring the LEGO mark and purporting to offer the Complainant's products for sale without any indication that it has no relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant does not, however, submit any evidence that the products offered for sale by the Respondent were not genuine products.

In the Panel's view, this case highlights a tension between two tests: first, the *Oki Data* test, which indicates criteria against which the legitimacy may be measured of a domain name incorporating the complainant's mark which is used to sell the genuine products of the complainant; and, second, the impersonation test, which assesses whether the use of the complainant's mark in the domain name amounts to an impersonation of the complainant.

The *Oki Data*¹ test as set out in section 2.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) outlines the following cumulative requirements for a finding that a respondent may have legitimate interests in such a domain name:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods at issue;
 - (ii) the respondent must use the site only to sell the trademarked goods;
 - (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder;
- and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

¹ *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

In this case, (i) the Respondent purports to offer the LEGO products; (ii) the Respondent does not appear to be selling goods other than those of the Complainant; (iii) according to the Complainant's evidence, the Respondent does not adequately disclose that it has no official relationship with the Complainant. There is no visible disclaimer stating that the website is not endorsed or sponsored by the Complainant or to explain the non-existing relationship with the trademark holder; (iv) there is no suggestion that the Respondent has attempted to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the Mark.

It follows that the Domain Name fails to pass the *Oki Data* test in the absence in particular of a clear, express disclaimer on the Respondent website as to the lack of a relationship with the Complainant. In any event, the Panel takes account of the tension between the *Oki Data* test and the "impersonation" test, which questions whether a domain name that consists of a trademark plus an additional term can constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. In this case, the Panel considers that there is a risk that Internet users will assume that the Domain Name is operated by or sanctioned by the Complainant in relation to the provision of LEGO products.

Accordingly, the Panel finds on balance that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There is no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name for a website selling LEGO products.

Furthermore, there can be no doubt that the Respondent registered the Domain Name with the intention that Internet users would be attracted to its website because of the inclusion in the Domain Name of the Mark. The Respondent clearly sees the inclusion of the Mark as of substantial assistance in promoting its business. However, as indicated above, there is a real risk that because of the composition of the Domain Name, Internet users would be misled into believing that the website at the Domain Name was operated or authorised by the Complainant. This indicates bad faith use of the Domain Name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. 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 Domain Name <legofun.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026