

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. 徐志芳(Zhi Fang Xu)

Case No. D2025-4364

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 徐志芳 (Zhi Fang Xu), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legoroll.com> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 23, 2025. On October 24, 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 in English on October 29, 2025.

On October 27, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On October 29, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on November 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

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Denmark. Founded in 1932, the Complainant produces and sells construction toys and related products under the LEGO brand. The Complainant has subsidiaries and branches worldwide, employs more than 28,500 people globally, and its products are sold in more than 130 countries including China. Over the years, the LEGO brand has been consistently recognized by consumer surveys and rankings, including Superbrands, as one of the world's leading consumer brands.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trade mark registrations for LEGO in jurisdictions around the world including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000039800 for LEGO registered on October 5, 1998;
- China Trade Mark Registration No. 75682 for LEGO registered on December 22, 2016.

(Individually and collectively referred to as the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant also owns an extensive portfolio of more than 6,000 domain names incorporating the Trade Mark. Its main websites are at the domain names <lego.com>. and <legoland.com>.

The Respondent, who appears to be based in China, registered the disputed domain name on May 14, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website offering for sale shoes, and which also purports also to sell pet products, according to the "About Us" section of the website (the "Website"). The goods offered on the Website are unrelated to the Complainant or its products. The disputed domain name has also been configured with mail exchanger ("MX") records, enabling email functionality. The Website's "Contact Us" section lists an email address using the disputed domain name, namely [...]@legoroll.com which appears to be used by the Respondent for commercial correspondence. On June 12, 2025, the Complainant's representatives sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent. Despite subsequent reminders, the Respondent did not reply.

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 to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for the following main reasons:

- The Complainant is unable to communicate in Chinese and translation of the Complaint would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter;
- Such additional delay, poses continuing risk to the Complainant or its products;
- The disputed domain name is comprised of Latin characters;
- The Website features various English phrases which indicates that the Respondent understands English;
- The term LEGO does not carry any specific meaning in the Chinese language; and
- The Respondent did not respond to request for communications to continue in Chinese after receiving the cease and desist letter.

The Respondent has not challenged the Complainant's language request and in fact has failed to file a response in either English or Chinese despite being duly notified by the Center in both English and Chinese of the language of the proceeding and of the commencement of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the word "roll" after the Trade Mark may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the word does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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 sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, 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 finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its Trade Mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Trade Mark enjoys an extensive worldwide reputation, including in China, and was registered decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. In these circumstances, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant or its Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain name.

As stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2:

“Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent’s claim not to have been aware of the complainant’s mark.”

The Panel further notes that the clear absence of any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, coupled with the Respondent’s selection of the disputed domain name without any explanation, constitutes an additional factor supporting a finding of bad-faith registration (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). In the Panel’s view, the disputed domain name falls squarely within the category of cases described therein. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Panel also finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website established for the Respondent's commercial benefit. It is highly likely that Internet users typing the disputed domain name into their browser, or encountering it via a search engine, would be expecting to reach a website operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The disputed domain name is therefore inherently misleading and likely to cause confusion among Internet users, particularly as it incorporates the Complainant's distinctive Trade Mark and is almost identical to the Complainant's own domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is seeking to exploit the reputation of the Trade Mark in order to mislead Internet users into visiting the Respondent's website. On the basis of the record, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, the Panel notes that an MX server has been configured on the disputed domain name.

As stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4:

"Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such purposes include sending email, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution. (In some such cases, the respondent may host a copycat version of the complainant's website.) Many such cases involve the respondent's use of the domain name to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information from prospective job applicants, or to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant's actual or prospective customers."

Although there is no evidence on the record that the Respondent has, to date, engaged in phishing or other fraudulent email activity, the Panel considers that the configuration of an email server on the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known Trade Mark constitutes an additional indicium of bad faith. In the circumstances of this case, such configuration gives rise to a credible risk of deceptive email use and reinforces the conclusion that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

Taking all of the above circumstances into account, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been satisfied.

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 <legoroll.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: December 18, 2025