

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LEGO Holding A/S v. John Bau dk  
Case No. D2025-4362

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is John Bau dk, Denmark.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <legopops.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 October 23, 2025. On October 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 27, 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 October 27, 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 October 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 18, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on November 18, 2025. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on November 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on December 4, 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 used in connection with the famous LEGO construction toys and other LEGO branded products. Founded in 1932, the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world, including Denmark. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries. Various surveys have recognized the LEGO trademark as a well-known trademark.

The Complainant is the owner of a very extensive registered trademark portfolio for LEGO (hereafter “the LEGO Trademark” or “the Trademark”), including:

- The Danish trademark registration no. VR 195400604 for LEGO (word mark), registered on May 1, 1954;
- The Danish trademark registration no. VR 202401171 for LEGO (word mark) registered on August 6, 2024;
- The European Union trademark registration no. 39800 for LEGO (word mark) registered on October 5, 1998.

The Complainant is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark, including <lego.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 28, 2025. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name originally resolved to a website offering for sale design furniture items. The Complainant sent cease and desist letters to the Respondent on July 23, 2025, July 30, 2025, and August 6, 2025. According to the Complaint, the website linked to the disputed domain name was then deactivated and the Respondent switched and continued to trade via the domain name <flexopop.com>. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name directs to a page where the brand FLEXOPOP is depicted and where Internet users are invited to click for being redirected to the <flexopop.com> website of 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.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LEGO Trademark. The LEGO Trademark is a well-known trademark and the disputed domain name reproduces the LEGO Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the suffix “pops”. The addition of the Top-Level Domain (TLD) “.com” does not have any impact on the confusing similarity.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent possesses no registered trademarks corresponding to the disputed domain name, nor any unregistered rights, and is not linked to, nor authorized by, the Complainant. The Complainant further asserts that it is highly unlikely that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant's rights in the LEGO Trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name as LEGO is a famous trademark worldwide. The Complainant further explains that the Respondent is not using the

disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has intentionally chosen the disputed domain name because it was confusingly similar to the Complainant's LEGO Trademark, in order to attract Internet users and generate traffic and income through its website selling furniture items. The Complainant further notes that, after the sending of cease and desist letters to the Respondent, the latter kept hold of the disputed domain name and used it to redirect Internet users to its new website.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. The LEGO Trademark has the status of a well-known and reputable trademark with a substantial and widespread goodwill throughout the world. The Respondent chose to register and use the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to its own website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website. After the sending by the Complainant of cease and desist letters to the Respondent, the latter, who did not respond to the Complainant's letters, took down the website under the disputed domain name and rebranded his services but nevertheless kept hold of the disputed domain name and included a redirection link to its new website. The Respondent's conduct is evidence of its bad faith in registering and using the disputed domain name. Besides, the Complainant notes that the Respondent has set up MX records for the disputed domain name, meaning that it might be used for, or in the future may be used for, email communication. Given the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's Trademark, any use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent for email communication would certainly imply an affiliation with the Complainant that does not exist, and so would be a use in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent sent an email to the Center on November 18, 2025. The Respondent contends that he acted in good faith as he was not aware that the disputed domain name was infringing on the Complainant's trademark rights. He explained that he was about to stop using the disputed domain name and already migrated all content to a new website. He proposed to sell it to the Complainant for EUR 200, being the expenses linked to the disputed domain name.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (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; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the LEGO Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The only difference between the LEGO Trademark and the disputed domain name is the addition of the suffix "pops". Although the addition of this term 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 Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Further, the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is a standard registration requirement.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LEGO Trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either. In its email to the Center dated November 18, 2025, the Respondent explained that he was not aware that the disputed domain name was infringing on the Complainant’s trademark rights and that he was about to stop using the disputed domain name and migrated all content to a new website. By this explanation, the Respondent implicitly but certainly acknowledges that he has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the LEGO Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the suffix “pops” (which is descriptive of a colorful style referring to the seventies) for a website offering design furniture items. The design furniture items feature the same vivid colors as the well-known LEGO construction toys and are also designated with a LEGOPOP brand. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. In the case at hand, both the disputed domain name (which literally reproduces the well-known LEGO Trademark with the mere addition of a descriptive suffix) and the website content (design items furniture in the same colorful style as the LEGO toys) indicate that the Respondent suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant and is using the disputed domain name for commercial gain by attempting to unduly benefit from the well-known character of the LEGO Trademark in order to generate traffic on its website.

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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy. The Panel notes that the Respondent has composed the disputed domain name by combining the Complainant's well-known LEGO Trademark with the suffix "pops" which is descriptive of a colorful design style and is also characteristic of the Complainant's products. Besides, a quick search for the term "lego" online would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its Trademark, all the more so since the Complainant is, as the Respondent, located in Denmark and owns trademark registrations in Denmark. As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant's Trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 3.2.2.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy considers that the domain name is used in bad faith when, by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location. In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name, which reproduces the well-known LEGO Trademark with the mere addition of the suffix "pops", falsely suggests that Internet users will find a website affiliated with, sponsored or endorsed by the Complainant (furniture items with the same colorful and fancy character as the LEGO construction toys). The Respondent has sought to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant, in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users on its website.

The Panel further notes that, after the sending by the Complainant of cease and desist letters to the Respondent and even after the start of the UDRP proceedings, the Respondent, who has acknowledged that he should and would stop using the disputed domain name, still uses the disputed domain name for a website redirecting the Internet users to his new website. Besides, the Panel notes that the furniture items on the Respondent new website are still designated as "legopop" items. The Respondent's conduct is further evidence of its bad faith in registering and using 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 <legopops.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mireille Buydens/*

**Mireille Buydens**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 15, 2025