

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC

Case No. D2025-2860

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lego.nexus> (hereinafter the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 18, 2025. On July 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 21, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 22, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 28, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on August 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on September 3, 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

Complainant owns the trademark LEGO (hereinafter the “Mark”), which has been ranked as one of the best-known trademarks worldwide. For instance, Superbrands UK,¹ ranked the LEGO Mark as the number two Consumer Superbrand (second only to ROLEX) and number two in the Consumer Relevancy Index. In 2024, the Reputation Institute² recognized Complainant and its related companies as number one for the second year in a row on its list of the world’s Top 10 Most Reputable Global Companies. In 2000, Forbes and Toy Retailers Association of the United Kingdom each named LEGO bricks as the “Toy of the Century”.

Complainant owns more than 6,000 domain names, including <lego.com>, which has a popularity rank of 1,136th globally and 675th in the United States of America. In January 2025 alone the website received a total of 38 million visits.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for the Mark in many jurisdictions worldwide, including:

- Denmark Registration Number 604-1954 (registered October 30, 1953)
- United States of America Trademark Registration Number 1,018,875 (registered August 26, 1975)

The Disputed Domain Name was registered March 5, 2025. The associated webpage plays music and displays links to social media sites such as Twitter (nowadays known as X) and TikTok.

On March 24, 2025, Complainant sent Respondent a cease-and-desist letter by email. Complainant advised Respondent that the unauthorized use of the Mark within the Disputed Domain Name violated Complainant’s rights, requested a voluntary transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, and offered compensation for Respondent’s actual expenses. Respondent did not respond.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

¹ Superbrands UK, is a company that identifies and awards “Superbrand” status to the brands in the United Kingdom, based on criteria like quality, reliability, and distinction. Through annual consumer and business surveys and expert panels, Superbrands compiles lists and publications that showcase highly regarded brands, allowing them to use the Superbrands recognition to strengthen their market position and reputation.

² The Reputation Institute, now known as RepTrak, is a company that publishes reports on the reputation of corporations based on consumer surveys and media coverage. It is headquartered in Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America.

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 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.

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 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Based on the evidence submitted, the Panel finds, as many prior panels have previously found, that the Mark is well known³ and that Respondent targeted in bad faith Complainant's Mark when he registered the Disputed Domain Name. "Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is

³ The Panel appreciates and commends Complainant's offer of evidence to support its claim that the Mark is well known. Complainant might have been forgiven if it had relied on the no doubt valid assumption that the LEGO trademark is universally recognized. But evidence of reputation must be introduced into the record. This is true even when, as here, prior panels have found that a trademark is well known. Merely alleging fame without offering evidence is not sufficient.

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. Respondent's failure to respond to Complainant's cease-and-desist letter also supports the Panel's finding of bad faith registration.

Respondent is also using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith intentionally "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [Respondent's] web site [. . .] by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location". Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The Panel finds 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 <lego.nexus> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2025