

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Jose Pereira
Case No. D2026-1732

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jose Pereira, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legonacopa.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 23, 2026. On April 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 24, 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 (Redacted for Privacy / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 24, 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 27, 2026, and the second amended Complaint on May 5, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and the second 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 May 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Juan Lapenne as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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 limited Company incorporated in Denmark. The Complainant and its licensees make and sell LEGO branded toys. The Complainant business was founded in 1932 and currently has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world, and employs more than 38,000 individuals.

As of January 1, 2025, LEGO Juris A/S has been renamed to LEGO Holding A/S to bring together all LEGO branded and related activities under one governance structure.

The Complainant owns a large number of LEGO trademark registrations throughout the world, such as:

United States of America trademark registration No. 2245652 for LEGO, registered on May 18, 1999, in international class 28.

United States of America trademark registration No. 4395578 for LEGO, registered on September 3, 2013, in international classes 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25 and 28.

Brazilian Trademark registration No. 730130533 for LEGO, registered on January 16, 1982, in international class 28.

The Complainant owns more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark. The Complainant primary domain name <lego.com> was registered on August 22, 1995.

The disputed domain name currently does not point to any active website. However, according to the documents, printouts and statements submitted by the Complainant – which have not been contested by the Respondent – prior to the present proceeding, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website offering for sale the Complainant's LEGO Official World Cup Trophy.

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 that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark LEGO in which the Complainant has rights, as it reproduces entirely the LEGO trademark. The addition of the terms "na" and "copa" does not diminish the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the LEGO trademark. The Complainant alleges that "na" is likely to refer to "North America" and "copa" to the upcoming World Cup. Besides, the Complainant contends that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is irrelevant to determine the confusing similarity between the trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that LEGO trademark is well-known and famous and, therefore, Internet users encountering the disputed domain will perceive the disputed domain name as either a domain name owned by the Complainant, or that there is some kind of commercial relation with the Complainant.

With reference to rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has never been licensed, authorized or permitted by the Complainant to use the trademark LEGO.

The Complainant highlights that to the best of its knowledge the Respondent has no trademark or tradename corresponding to the disputed domain name.

In addition to the above, the Complainant contends that the Respondent impersonated the Complainant by using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant's logo and offering for sale the LEGO Official World Cup Trophy.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent does not adequately disclose the relationship, or lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant and that there is no visible disclaimer stating that the website was not endorsed or sponsored by the Complainant.

In view of the above, the Complainant emphasizes that the Respondent was in no way making a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant contends that due to the well-known character of the LEGO trademark, the Respondent cannot claim to have been using the trademark LEGO without being aware of the Complainant's right to it.

Therefore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, but is instead misleadingly diverting consumers for his own commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15 (a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights over the trademark LEGO based on the trademark registrations cited under section 4 above.

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 domain name in question is <legonacopa.com>. The Complainant holds a large number of registered trademarks of the word LEGO and is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the term LEGO. The Panel finds, as previous panels have found before, that the Complainant has established that LEGO is a well-known and famous trademark.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LEGO trademark, as it entirely incorporates the well-known and famous LEGO trademark with the mere addition of descriptive and generic terms (“na” and “copa”) and the gTLD “.com”. Indeed, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive or meaningless terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (TLD) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has established rights according to paragraph 4 (a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

In the instant case, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to incorporate its LEGO trademark in the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent a licensee or otherwise affiliated to the Complainant.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4 (c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying Complainant’s logo, on which the LEGO “official” World Cup was offered for sale. In addition, the website displayed in a very small print the following statement, which created the overall impression that the Respondent was either the Complainant itself or was affiliated with the Complainant: “2026 All rights reserved. LEGO is a registered trademark of the LEGO Group”.

Although the website contained a disclaimer, it was displayed at the very bottom of the website and in a very small print. Hence, the Respondent does not accurately disclose the relationship with the trademark owner. See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the overall impression of the website is of one of an affiliation with the Complainant which does not in fact exist. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.7.

In the absence of any authorization from the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is misleading Internet users, inducing them to believe that the Respondent's website belongs to the Complainant or at least is sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant, hence the Respondent is unduly profiting from the goodwill of the Complainant's well-known trademark.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name was registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith.

In the present case the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered a disputed domain name identical to the Complainant's well-known trademark. Further, the Respondent's website displays the Complainant's logo and offer for sale the "official" LEGO World Cup Trophy with no adequate disclaimer. These circumstances suggest that the Respondent knew the Complainant and its business at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, by using the disputed domain name in the manner described above, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

The Panel finds that 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 name <legonacopa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Juan Lapenne/

Juan Lapenne

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2026.