

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Luis Daniel Chacon
Case No. D2026-0810

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Luis Daniel Chacon, Costa Rica.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legobikecr.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 25, 2026. On February 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 26, 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 (User #3c2b3fa6 Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 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 March 4, 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 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin as the sole panelist in this matter on April 10, 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 following summary sets out the uncontested factual submission made by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant is the owner of the LEGO trademark (the “Trademark”) and variants thereof related to, inter alia, construction toys, computer hardware and software, books, videos and computer controlled robotic construction sets.

4.2 Founded in 1932, the Complainant currently operates on a global basis including five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals and its products are sold in more than 130 countries.

4.3 Through widespread sales, marketing and advertising activities, the Trademark has acquired considerable reputation and goodwill. This includes being listed in the official Top 10 Consumer Superbrands for 2023 by UK Superbrands, No.1 of the World’s Top 10 Most Reputable Global Companies of 2024 for the second year in a row by the Reputation Institute, recognition in 2000 by Forbes and Toy Retailers Association of the United Kingdom for LEGO bricks as the Toy of the Century and being named in 2024 by Circana as Toy Manufacturer of the year for the third year in a row.

4.4 The Complainant owns numerous registrations for the Trademark and variations thereof in many jurisdictions worldwide. The following table includes a sample of registrations of the Trademark by the Complainant (whether on its own or through its related or associated company) in selected jurisdictions:

Jurisdiction	Mark	Registration Number	Date of Registration	Classification of Goods / Services
Costa Rica	LEGO	41845	November 12, 1970	28
Denmark	LEGO	VR 1954 00604	May 1, 1954	28

4.5 Additionally, the Complainant has registered more than 6,000 domain names which incorporate the Trademark. The Complainant’s group of companies also maintain websites under the domain names <lego.com> and <legoland.com>. According to Similarweb.com, the Complainant’s website located at the domain name <lego.com> has a popularity rank of 1,136th globally and 675th in the United States of America. In January 2025, the website received a total of 38 million visits.

4.6 The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on January 19, 2026.

4.7 The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website offering products that bear the Trademark. The Trademark is prominently displayed throughout the Respondent’s website and on product images. The mail exchange (MX) records have been configured, which means it may be used for email communication purposes.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends, inter alia, as follows:

5.1 The Complainant asserts that the Trademark is distinctive, is a well-known trademark that is used globally and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the following reasons:

- (a) the disputed domain name incorporates the Trademark in its entirety.
- (b) the addition of the word "bikecr" does not change that fact and would instead cause Internet users to be confused as to whether an association exists between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

5.2 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because:

- (a) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Whois registration details indicate that the name of the registrant is Luis Daniel Chacon, which has no bearing whatsoever with the disputed domain name.
- (b) the Respondent has not registered any trademarks or trade names that correspond with the disputed domain name.
- (c) the Complainant has not authorised, licensed or permitted the Respondent to use the Trademark and neither is the Respondent an authorized dealer of the Complainant's products. The Respondent has never had a business relationship with the Complainant.
- (d) at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Respondent was using a privacy or proxy service, evidencing a lack of legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and bad faith.
- (e) the Respondent does not adequately disclose the relationship, or lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant, and is using the Complainant's product images throughout the Respondent's website in a manner that conveys to an unsuspecting Internet user that the disputed domain name is in some way connected to, authorised by or affiliated with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.
- (f) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for a noncommercial or fair use, without intent for commercial gain, but rather to misleadingly divert consumers.
- (g) the Trademark is globally famous and is synonymous with the Complainant's goods and services.

5.3 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith and relies on the following:

- (a) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant first registered the Trademark. The Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant given the Complainant's global reputation and the ubiquitous presence of the Trademark on the Internet. The notoriety of the Trademark motivated the Respondent to register the disputed domain name.

- (b) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Respondent intentionally selected the well-known Trademark to generate traffic in order to sell products that bore the Trademark.
- (c) the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.
- (d) the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use but, instead, registered and is using the disputed domain name to intentionally mislead the public into believing that the Respondent is associated or affiliated with the Complainant.
- (e) the Trademark has acquired the status of a well-known and reputable trademark with substantial and widespread goodwill throughout the world. Apart from the achievements of the Complainant, there is also evidence of a considerable number of third-party domain name registrations comprising the Trademark in combination with other words which, to an extent, demonstrates the attractiveness of the Trademark for those seeking to ride on its reputation and goodwill, in bad faith.
- (f) email communications that are facilitated through the MX records could not reasonably be used for any good faith purpose given circumstances of the use of the disputed domain name. It is likely that the disputed domain name may be actively used to facilitate fraudulent activity such as phishing, impersonating or passing off as the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant is required to establish the following elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (a) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (b) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (c) that 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 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. The Panel is satisfied with the evidence adduced by the Complainant of various registrations of the Trademark.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms here, "bikecr", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity

between the disputed domain name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 3.1](#), 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. 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 Complainant has clearly stated that it has not authorized the Respondent in any way to use the Trademark or to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant has also denied any affiliation or association with the Respondent. The disputed domain name is used for a commercial website offering products that bear the Trademark without any disclaimer as to its lack of relationship with the Complainant, which does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel finds the second element 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.

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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the respondent’s website or location, then this would justify a finding of bad faith.

The Panel is cognizant of the global reputation and goodwill attached to the Trademark. The Panel finds that by registering and using the disputed domain name as described above the Respondent intended to free ride on the goodwill of the Complainant's Trademark. This is supported by the following collective factors:

- (a) the date of registration of the disputed domain name, which was long after the Trademark was registered and acquired distinctiveness and global appeal;
- (b) the inclusion of the Trademark in its entirety in the disputed domain name;
- (c) the manner in which the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to resolve to a website which prominently displays the Complainant's Trademark, product images and products that bear the Trademark without any indication of its lack of relationship with the Complainant;
- (d) the commercial nature of the Respondent's website which included MX records and which sought to offer for sale products that bore the Trademark without authority, license, consent or approval from the Complainant and without complying with the requirements of the Oki Data test.

Having reviewed the record, therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <legobikecr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin/

Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin

Sole Panelist

Date: April 16, 2026