

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Nawaf Hariri, Salla Application Company
Case No. D2025-0313

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Nawaf Hariri, Salla Application Company, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <elego-brand.com> and <legoksa.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 27, 2025. On January 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 27, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names .

The Center verified that the 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 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on March 6, 2025. 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 in the business of selling construction toys and other products branded with its LEGO trademark. It owns trademark registrations for the LEGO mark in jurisdictions around the world, including a registration in Saudi Arabia (Reg. No. 139400159, registered on November 25, 1974) and in the United States of America (Reg. No. 1018875, registered on August 26, 1975).

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain names were registered as follows: <legoKSA.com> on August 17, 2024, and <elego-brand.com> on September 20, 2023. Prior to receiving the Complainant's cease and desist letter, the Respondent used the disputed domain name <legoKSA.com> to resolve to a website offering a range of tech items for sale, though that website was subsequently taken down. As of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name <elego-brand.com> remained active and resolved to a website promoting the sale of clothing items.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 are being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), 0, section 1.7. The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the LEGO mark by providing evidence of its longstanding and widespread trademark registrations, including in Saudi Arabia, where the Respondent is located (since 1974) and the United States (since 1975). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Both disputed domain names incorporate the LEGO mark in its entirety. The disputed domain name <legoKSA.com> simply adds the letters "ksa" while the disputed domain name <elego-brand.com> prefixes an "e" and appends "-brand". These additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The LEGO mark remains readily recognizable in both of the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is standard practice to disregard the Top-Level Domain (".com") when assessing confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element by considering whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. If so, the burden shifts to the Respondent to rebut this showing. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

On this point, the Complainant asserts that: (1) the Respondent has no trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain names, (2) the Respondent is known as “Nawaf Hariri, Salla Application Company,” a name unrelated to the LEGO brand, (3) the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the LEGO mark, (4) the Respondent is not an authorized dealer of LEGO products, (5) there is no business relationship between the parties, (6) the Respondent is not using the LEGO mark as a company name, and (7) the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to sell unrelated products (tech items and clothing).

These assertions make out a prima facie case. The Respondent has not submitted any Response or evidence to rebut this showing. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant has shown that the LEGO trademark is well known globally and predates the registration of the disputed domain names by several decades. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names <legoksa.com> and <elego-brand.com> in 2024 and 2023, respectively, long after the Complainant’s mark had achieved worldwide recognition.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant’s rights and to exploit the LEGO brand’s goodwill. Both domain names were used in connection with commercial websites offering goods unrelated to LEGO, without any affiliation or disclaimer. This strongly supports a finding of intentional targeting for commercial gain. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, the Complainant has submitted evidence that the Respondent has been the subject of at least five previous UDRP decisions involving similar conduct (e.g., *Les Parfumeries Fragonard v. Nawaf Hariri, Salla*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0192](#)) and has registered domain names incorporating other famous marks (e.g., BARBIE, NIKE, NETFLIX, TWITTER, ZARA). This pattern of conduct supports a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent’s failure to respond to the Complainant’s cease and desist letter, or to this proceeding, also supports a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 names <elego-brand.com> and <legoksa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: March 21, 2025