

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Viktor Pekin

Case No. D2026-1355

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Viktor Pekin, Bulgaria, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <legeobetonblock.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com, and the disputed domain name <legobetonblock.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 30, 2026. On March 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 1, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY / GDPR Masked) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 1, 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 April 9, 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 April 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 6, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on April 22, 2026. However, the Respondent did not file any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on May 7, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on May 15, 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 which is the owner of rights in the LEGO brand of construction toys and other LEGO branded products. LEGO branded products are sold in more than 130 countries worldwide (including Bulgaria) and the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world. The use of the LEGO brand also extends to products such as computer hardware and software, books, videos, and computer controlled robotic construction sets.

The Complainant is the owner of number of registered trademarks for the LEGO trademark, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration No. 000039800 for LEGO, registered on October 5, 1998;
- Bulgarian trademark registration No. 13969, for ЛЕГО, registered on June 28, 1983; and
- International trademark registration No. 287932 for LEGO, registered on August 27, 1964.

The Complainant is the owner of over 6,000 domain name registrations containing the LEGO trademark, such as <lego.com> registered on August 22, 1995.

The disputed domain name <legobetonblock.com> was registered on December 8, 2023.

The disputed domain name <legeobetonblock.com> was registered on June 3, 2025.

The website at the disputed domain name <legeobetonblock.com> is in Bulgarian. This website is for a Bulgarian company called Nyu Beton Blok EOOD (New Concrete Block Ltd), which specializes in the manufacturing of modular, interlocking concrete blocks (often referred to as “Lego-style” concrete blocks). The website states that they produce patented modular concrete blocks designed for easy assembly. The system is flexible and suitable for both temporary and permanent construction projects. They have over 15 years of experience and produce more than 24,000 blocks annually. Common applications in retaining walls, firewalls, sound barrier walls and dividing walls for grain storage. This website refers to LEGO type concrete blocks (spelt as “LEGO” not “LEGEO”).

The website at the disputed domain name <legobetonblock.com> currently does not resolve to an active website, but at the time the Complaint was filed it resolved to a website that had similar content to the website located at <legeobetonblock.com>.

The Respondent did not file a formal Response, so little information is known about the Respondent.

The Respondent set an email communication to the Center using an email address from the domain name <webstationbg.com>. This website advertises the services of web designers and states: “Our experienced web design and digital marketing experts will talk to you and take the lead in making your vision a reality. We solve complex problems with custom website development tailored to the unique needs of your business.”

The Respondent’s email communication to the Center identifies the Respondent as a marketing manager and states: “I don’t understand what this is about? Why is all this happening? I’m just a web developer who creates websites for other people. I don’t know anything about any complaint nor have I filed one.”

The Complainant sent of cease and desist letter to “Lego Beton Block” on May 2, 2025, at the email address used on the websites at the disputed domain names. There was no reply to this letter. However, after receiving this letter, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <legeobetonblock.com> and the company name used was changed from “Lego Beton Block” to “New Beton Block”.

The Panel is aware of media reports from April 2025 that state that a court in The Hague has ruled that the Dutch company Betonblock can no longer frequently use the name “Lego” on its website. The company, based in Heerhugowaard, manufactures steel molds for concrete blocks and had used the term “Lego” extensively in its online marketing. This lawsuit was not referred to in the Complainant and has not been relied upon by the Panel in this decision.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Complainant’s LEGO mark is famous and known in Bulgaria (where the Respondent is located), that the disputed domain name <legeobetonblock.com> is typosquatting, and that the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the LEGO mark.

The Respondent appears to be operating in the construction business and claims to be a manufacturer of “concrete blocks”. The Respondent defines these blocks as “Inspired by the principle of ‘Lego ® bricks’”. Such unauthorized and commercial use of the Complainant’s LEGO trademark fails to constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant acknowledges the existence of the construction material used by the Respondent but points to the fact that such material is in fact named and widely referred to as “interlocking concrete blocks”. As admitted by the Respondent on the linked websites, there is a difference between “inspired” and “generic” and the Complainant’s LEGO trademark cannot be used in a generic manner to describe third-party goods, in which the Respondent would claim a bona fide use of the registered trademark. The Respondent’s decision to incorporate without authorization the LEGO trademark in the disputed domain names is evidence of the disputed domain names deriving unfair interest from LEGO’s reputation, which cannot constitute rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Respondent’s conduct after receiving the Complainant’s cease and desist letter can be taken as the Respondent’s tacit acceptance of their said infringement.

The composition of the disputed domain name suggests to Internet users a connection of the disputed domain name with the LEGO trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

Each of the disputed domain names must be considered separately.

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 finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In respect of the disputed domain name <legeobetonblock.com>, this domain name uses "legeo" not "lego". A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "beton" and "block") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent is a website developer and did not come forward with any evidence or submissions in respect of his client or his client's connection to the websites at the disputed domain names. Compare *WK Travel, Inc. v. Mohamed Samaha*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3503](#). Thus, there is no evidence that the Respondent, a website developer, has a legitimate interest in a business making building products for walls.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease and desist letter or to the Complainant. This suggests that the Respondent (and his client) has no basis or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

For the reasons set out below in respect of the third element of the Policy, the Panel considers that the use of the disputed domain names is not bona fide or legitimate.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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.

The Respondent clearly had knowledge of the Complainant's famous LEGO brand because the term LEGO was used on the websites at the disputed domain names.

The Respondent is a website developer acting on behalf of the business advertised on the website at the disputed domain name <legobetonblock.com>. When the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to that business, the Respondent shortly thereafter registered the disputed domain name <legeobetonblock.com>. This is also evidence of knowledge of the Complainant and bad faith conduct. Further, the company name of the business was changed soon after receiving this letter from "Lego Beton Block" to "New Beton Block". The Panel views these actions as at least an implicit acknowledgement that the Respondent's use of LEGO was in bad faith. However, the Respondent continued to use the term LEGO (or a misspelling thereof) in the disputed domain names and on the websites at the disputed domain names.

The Complainant's LEGO mark is distinctive and well-known.

The composition of the disputed domain names suggests to Internet users a connection of the disputed domain names with the LEGO trademark. The descriptive term "block" used in the disputed domain names is clearly associated with the Complainant's business, i.e. toys which allow customers to build predesigned structures using only small sized blocks. The Panel considers that the Respondent selected and used the term LEGO (or a misspelling thereof) in the disputed domain names to take advantage of the Complainant's LEGO mark.

By using the disputed domain names, the Respondent is misleadingly diverting consumers for commercial gain and engaging in behaviour detrimental to the Complainant's trademark and business.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 names <legeobetonblock.com> and <legobetonblock.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: May 30, 2026