

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. maria silva
Case No. D2025-3593

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is maria silva, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lego-br.store> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 5, 2025. On September 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 8, 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 (Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 9, 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 September 12, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint [together with the amendment to the Complaint/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 September 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 8, 2025.

The Center appointed José de Pierola as the sole panelist in this matter on October 10, 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

LEGO Holding A/S (hereinafter referred to as the “Complainant”), formerly known as LEGO Juris A/S, is a company headquartered in Denmark, is the proprietor of the LEGO trademark, along with a range of other marks associated with its globally recognized LEGO brand of construction toys and related products. The Complainant grants licenses to authorized entities to use its intellectual property rights (including trademark rights) within Brazil and internationally.

Since its founding in 1932, the Complainant's business operations have experienced substantial growth. The LEGO Group now comprises a global network of subsidiaries and affiliates, including five regional hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing facilities, and more than 500 branded retail stores. The organization employs over 28,500 individuals worldwide, and its products are distributed in more than 130 countries, including Brazil.

The Complainant has listed evidence to show to be the owner of several trade/service marks registered worldwide that relate to their company name LEGO, such as:

- Brazilian certificate of registration No. 730130533, for trademark LEGO, in class 28, registered on January 16, 1982 and in force until January 16, 2032.
- Japanese certificate of registration No. 2086819, for trademark LEGO, in class 28, registered on October 26, 1988 and in force until October 26, 2028.
- US certificate of registration No. 2.245.652, for trademark LEGO, in class 28, registered on May 18, 1999 and in force until May 18, 2029.

The Complaint argues that trade/service marks LEGO are worldwide well-known, as per the different accolades received through the years by worldwide rankings, in which LEGO ranks among top 5 in Super Brands, Consumer Relevancy, Reputable Companies, Forbes and Toy Retailers Associations.

The Complainant is also owner of more than 6,000 domain names that contain the LEGO trade/service mark, such as <lego.com>, used to promote LEGO's toy products and its related services worldwide.

The disputed Domain Name was created on July 17, 2025. The webpage have had two uses, as follow:

1. Generate traffic and income by offering for sale LEGO Icons McLaren Ayrton Senna models, while also featuring the Complainant's trade mark LEGO, its logo and its product.
2. Since the Complainant started the takedown actions, the webpage now redirects to a blank page without any content.

The Complainant requested that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

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 Domain Name is confusingly similar to its LEGO mark (the “Mark”) and its registered domain name <lego.com>, and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In this case, the Complainant must prove that the Disputed Domain name:

1. is identical or confusingly similar to its LEGO trade/service marks and domain names
2. is not related to any of the Respondent rights or legitimate interests
3. was registered and used by the Respondent 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 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 or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “store”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed, impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, noting the nature of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that it carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant's trademark. [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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank page) 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, 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed, impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. 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 <lego-br.store> be transferred to the Complainant

/José de Pierola/

José de Pierola

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2025