

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. deng qingguo
Case No. D2025-1152

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is deng qingguo, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lego-eustore.shop> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 20, 2025. On March 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 21, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 March 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Dilek Zeybel as the sole panelist in this matter on May 2, 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, LEGO Holding A/S (formerly known as LEGO Juris A/S), a limited company incorporated in Denmark, operates a business in the field of construction toys and related products and is the owner of the worldwide well-known LEGO brand.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations worldwide, including but not limited to the following:

- Chinese trademark, LEGO no. 75682 registered on December 22, 1976, in class 28.
- Chinese trademark, LEGO no. 1112413 registered on September 28, 1997, in class 28.
- Danish trademark, LEGO no. VR195400604 registered on May 1, 1954, in class 28.

The Complainant owns a large portfolio of domain names incorporating its LEGO trademark, including <lego.com>. The Complainant maintains the website “www.lego.com”, which serves as the official global platform for promoting and selling LEGO construction toys, related products, and services.

The Complainant operates through subsidiaries and branches worldwide, and its LEGO products are sold in over 130 countries.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on December 6, 2024. According to the evidence submitted, the disputed domain name resolves to a landing page that displays an error message stating: “This site can’t be reached”.

There is no evidence of any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent.

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 its earlier well-known and famous trademarks LEGO, being used to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant, misleadingly and to take unfair advantage of the reputation of its marks.

Further, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is unauthorized and states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in using the disputed domain name or trademarks and is unknown to the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that LEGO is one of the leading brands in the world, relying on its well-known status under Article 6bis of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property. The Complainant further claims that the protection afforded to the LEGO trademark extends far beyond toys and similar goods.

Additionally, the Complainant cites earlier UDRP decisions in which the LEGO trademark has been confirmed to be well-recognized, world-famous, and distinctive, enjoying a high reputation as construction toys.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant. It is neither an authorized dealer, distributor, or licensee of the Complainant, nor has it been permitted by the Complainant to use its prior rights.

The Complainant further contends that the hyphen added to the suffix “eustore” serves to underscore and increase the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark, and does not serve to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s trademark, thereby causing a likelihood of confusion that includes an obvious association with the well-known LEGO trademark.

Other domain names registered by the same Respondent, such as <bmwstore-eu.shop>, <bmwwmotorcycle.shop>, and <lidlparkssid-eu.shop>, have been cited by the Complainant to support its allegation of the Respondent’s general bad faith targeting well-known and famous trademarks.

Finally, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 7, 2025, and the Respondent did not respond.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules directs the Panel as to the principles to be applied in determining the dispute: “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”.

The Policy provides, at paragraph 4(a), that each of the three elements must be made for a complaint to prevail:

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name;
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, where a party does not comply with any provision of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate.

Considering the Parties’ submissions, the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, and applicable law, the Panel’s findings with respect to each of the above elements are set out below.

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 Complainant’s famous and well-known LEGO trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

In addition, it is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain “.shop” can be disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the addition of the term “eustore” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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 notes that the disputed domain name carries a risk of affiliation with the Complainant’s trademark. Such use of a domain name cannot be considered fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Even if the website at the disputed domain name is inactive, such use, if active, would not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and does not and would not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Furthermore, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without the Complainant’s authorization or approval.

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 non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use. The Panel notes that additional circumstances not explicitly listed in the Policy may also support a finding of bad faith, in line with [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name entirely reproduces the Complainant’s well-known trademark LEGO. The Panel finds that it is implausible that the Respondent arrived at the disputed domain name combination of “lego”-“eu”, “store” by coincidence. This indicates that the Respondent either knew or should have known the Complainant’s trademark and deliberately targeted it.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. The Panel shares this view.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent also holds several other domain names that appear to target well-known trademarks, including <bmwstore-eu.shop> and <bmwmotorcycle.shop>, as well as <lidl parksid-eu.shop>. This pattern of conduct is consistent with bad faith registration under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, the implausibility of any good faith use the disputed domain may be put, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

While the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter supports the Panel's finding of bad faith, it also reinforces the inference that the Respondent lacks any legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

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 <lego-eustore.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dilek Zeybel/

Dilek Zeybel

Sole Panelist

Date: May 16, 2025