

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. he he, he shu peng
Case No. D2025-2181

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is he he, he shu peng, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <Inlego.com> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 4, 2025. On June 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 6, 2025 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 6, 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 June 9, 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 June 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Lynda J. Zadra-Symes as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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 the owner of the LEGO trademark, and all other trademarks used in connection with the famous LEGO brands of construction toys and other LEGO branded products. The Complainant's licensees are authorized to exploit the Complainant's intellectual property rights in China, the United States of America ("United States") and elsewhere. Founded in 1932, the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores.

The Complainant's LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in China and the United States.

The Complainant is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark, including Chinese trademark No. 10176415, registered on January 14, 2013. The Complainant has expanded its use of the LEGO trademark to, inter alia, computer hardware and software, books, videos, and computer controlled robotic construction sets. The Complainant also maintains extensive websites under the domain names <lego.com> and <legoland.com>. According to Similarweb.com, the website at the Complainant's LEGO.com primary domain name has a popularity rank of 1,136th globally and 675th in the United States. In January 2025 alone, the website received a total of 38 million visits.

Complainant's LEGO mark is well-known worldwide, as evidenced by numerous consumer survey publications, including *Consumer Superbrands*, *Reputation Institute* - Top 10 Most Reputable Global Companies, *Forbes* and *Toy Retailers Association* ("Toy of the Century").

The disputed domain name was registered on March 28, 2025 and resolves to a website displaying pornographic content.

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 with the Complainant's LEGO mark, that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 demonstrated that it has strong trademark rights in its LEGO trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety. The addition of the term "In" does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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 Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the trademark LEGO. The Respondent is not an authorized dealer of the Complainant's products and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain name is used to host a website which displays predominantly pornographic content. In addition, the website advertises links that redirect users to websites of third-party services not related to the Complainant. The record indicates that the Respondent is trading off the fame of Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to Respondent's pornographic website for Respondent's commercial gain.

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 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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's LEGO trademark is famous and has the status of a well-known and reputable trademark with substantial and widespread goodwill throughout the world. It is inconceivable that Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain name. The pornographic nature of the content on the Respondent's website further indicates that Respondent is using Complainant's famous mark in the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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 <Inlego.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lynda J. Zadra-Symes/

Lynda J. Zadra-Symes

Sole Panelist

Date: July 30, 2025