

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Ivan Grodetkiy

Case No. D2025-2885

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ivan Grodetkiy, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lego.channel> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 21, 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 23, 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 the Complainant on July 23, 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 July 25, 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 July 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Anita Gerewal as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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

Founded in 1932, the Complainant is a well-known Denmark based company for LEGO construction toys which are sold in more than 130 countries and owns numerous trademarks and trade names for LEGO, dating back decades, in several jurisdictions around the world.

The Complainant owns inter alia the following LEGO trademark registrations:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000039800 in Classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 20, 24, 25, 28, 38, 41 and 42, registered on October 5, 1998.
- Cyprus Trademark Registration No. 23813 in Class 3, registered on March 27, 1984.

The Complainant owns more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark including the domain name <lego.com> which resolves to the official LEGO website.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 17, 2025, and currently resolves to an inactive website. Publicly available DNS records indicate that MX (Mail Exchange) records appear to have been configured for the disputed domain name.

On March 18, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via the email address for the privacy service. On April 3, 2025, and June 3, 2025, the Complainant received replies in which the sender of the emails expressed willingness to transfer the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent subsequently stopped replying.

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 comprises the term "lego", identical to the trademark LEGO, registered by the Complainant as trademarks and domain names in numerous countries all over the world. The addition of the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".channel" 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 trademark and the disputed domain name. The likelihood of confusion includes an obvious association with the trademark of the Complainant.

The Complainant also contends that the Complainant has not found that the Respondent has any registered trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Complainant has also not found anything, including in the Whois details, that would suggest that the Respondent has been using LEGO in any other way that would give the Respondent any legitimate rights in the disputed domain name. In the present case, the Registrant of the disputed domain name has been identified as "Ivan Grodetskiy", which does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. Thus, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name and the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. No license or authorization of any other kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent, to use the trademark LEGO. Furthermore, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent was using a privacy Whois service, which is also indicative of lacking legitimate interest. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain

name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent has intentionally chosen a domain name based on a registered trademark in order to redirect Internet users to a website that resolves to a blank page and lacks content. The Respondent has not demonstrated any attempt to make legitimate use of the disputed domain name and the website to which it resolves to, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Additionally, the disputed domain name has been setup by the Respondent with an email enabling MX record. The Complainant believes that the Respondent is likely to use or intends to use the email addresses hosted by the disputed domain name to confuse Internet users into believing they are dealing with the Complainant when they are not. The Respondent likely intends to use the email from the disputed domain name to pass itself off as the Complainant and/or for fraudulent purposes which is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Complainant further submits that the trademark LEGO in respect of toys belonging to the Complainant has the status of a well-known and reputed trademark with a substantial and widespread reputation throughout the world. The awareness of the trademark LEGO is considered, in general, to be significant and substantial. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 17, 2025, which is subsequent to when the Complainant registered the trademark LEGO in the European Union, and elsewhere, by decades. It is obvious that it is the fame of the trademark that has motivated the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent cannot claim to have been using the trademark LEGO, without being aware of the Complainant's rights to it. The disputed domain name is connected to an inactive site and the Complainant submits that the passive holding of the disputed domain name constitutes a factor in finding bad faith registration and use. The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name with the likely intent to pass itself off as the Complainant and/or defraud Internet users via email hosted at the disputed domain name are evidence of bad faith. The existence of active MX records attached to the disputed domain name, permitting the ability for the disputed domain name to be used for email, creates an ongoing implied threat to the Complainant that the disputed domain name may be used for fraudulent activities, which further supports an inference of bad faith.

The Complainant also submits that before filing this UDRP case, it had contacted the Respondent on March 18, 2025, through a cease-and-desist letter sent by email. The Complainant advised the Respondent that the unauthorized use of the LEGO trademark within the disputed domain name violated the Complainant's rights in said trademark. The Complainant requested a voluntary transfer of the disputed domain name and offered compensation for the expenses of registration and transfer fees (not exceeding out of pocket expenses). The Respondent replied initially expressing willingness to transfer the disputed domain name and requested the Complainant's registrar account details, however despite follow-up correspondence having been sent, the Respondent stopped replying.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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; and
- (iii) The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 the LEGO trademark 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 without any addition or changes and accordingly the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The TLD ".channel" is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 observes that the Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to use its LEGO trademark or to register a domain name that includes the LEGO trademark. The Panel also notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The evidence provided by the Complainant indicates that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, which the Panel does not consider as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Additionally, the evidence suggests that the Respondent may intend to use the disputed domain name for fraudulent activities, as evidenced by the setup of MX (Mail Exchange) records. MX records are used to route incoming emails to the appropriate mail server associated with a specific domain name and as such poses a risk that the disputed domain name could be employed to impersonate the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 disputed domain name includes the Complainant's well-known trademark in its entirety and is identical to the LEGO trademark. The disputed domain name was registered long after the registration of the Complainant's LEGO mark. This suggests that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page and active MX records are attached to the disputed domain name, indicating the possibility that the Respondent is engaged or may engage in the future in questionable activities. The Respondent has not provided a convincing reason for selecting the disputed domain name, and the Panel believes there is a substantial risk that emails sent from this disputed domain name could be misleading or deceptive, creating a false impression of an affiliation with the Complainant.

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 and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put due to its nature, 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.

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.channel> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anita Gerewal/

Anita Gerewal

Sole Panelist

Date: September 8, 2025