

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LEGO Holding A/S v. sulaiman sulaiman

Case No. D2025-0495

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is sulaiman sulaiman, Indonesia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <legoland.wiki> 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 7, 2025. On February 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 February 10, 2025, 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 12, 2025.

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 February 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on March 18, 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**

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, including LEGO Juris A/S and all rights/licenses to the LEGO brand.

The Complainant is the owner of LEGO, LEGOLAND, and other trademarks used in connection with the famous LEGO brands of construction toys and other LEGO branded products, including Indonesia trademark registration No. IDM000208750 for the mark LEGO, registered on June 26, 2009; United States Registration No. 1018875 for the mark LEGO, registered on August 26, 1975; Indonesia trademark registration No. IDM000879963 for the mark LEGOLAND, registered on August 9, 2021; and United States Registration No. 75504012, for the mark LEGOLAND, registered on March 28, 2000.

The Complainant's licensees are authorized to exploit the Complainant's intellectual property rights, including its trademark rights, in Indonesia and elsewhere. Over the years, the business of making and selling LEGO branded toys has grown remarkably. The Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world, and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including Indonesia. Moreover, the LEGOLAND theme parks have about 1.4 million visitors per year.

The Complainant put forward evidence the LEGO trademarks, including the LEGOLAND trademark, have been recognized as being famous. For instance, the official list of the Top 10 Consumer Superbrands for 2019, provided by Superbrands UK, showing LEGO as the number 1 Consumer Superbrand and number 8 in the Consumer Relevancy Index.

The LEGO Group has expanded its use of the LEGO trademark to, inter alia, computer hardware and software, books, videos, and computer controlled robotic construction sets. The LEGO Group also maintains an extensive website under the domain name <lego.com>. The LEGOLAND trademark is being used by the LEGO Group regarding for example, theme parks, hotels, entertainment, sporting, and cultural activities. Further, the LEGO Group maintains a website under the domain name <legoland.com>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on October 2, 2024. This date is decades after the Complainant registered the trademarks LEGO and LEGOLAND in Indonesia, where the Respondent is located and elsewhere. The website under the disputed domain name redirects to a commercial website offering casino, sports betting, lottery and other gambling services.

#### **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.

The disputed domain name comprises solely of the name "legoland", identical to the registered trademark LEGOLAND registered by the Complainant as trademarks and domain names in numerous countries all over the world. The addition of the top-level domain (TLD) ".wiki" does not have any impact on the overall impression of the dominant portion of the disputed domain name and is therefore irrelevant to determine the confusing similarity between the trademarks and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not found that the Respondent has any registered trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant has not found anything that would suggest that the Respondent has been using LEGO or LEGOLAND in any other way that would provide legitimate rights in any of the names. Consequently, the Respondent may not claim any rights established by common usage.

By redirecting the disputed domain name to a gambling website, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark LEGOLAND for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 3.0](#), 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 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. It appears that it is the fame of the trademarks that has motivated the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. That is, the Respondent cannot claim to have been using the trademarks LEGO and LEGOLAND, without being aware of the Complainant's rights to them. Instead, the Respondent has intentionally chosen a domain name based on a registered trademark in order to generate traffic and income through redirecting Internet users to a commercial website that is offering casino, sports betting, lottery and other gambling services, not related to the Complainant in any way. The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and of the services offered therein.

Having reviewed the record, 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, <legoland.wiki>, be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/*

**Elizabeth Ann Morgan**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2025