

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lego Holding A/S v. Jonathan Sidy, The Jonathan Company
Case No. D2025-4378

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jonathan Sidy, The Jonathan Company, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <legoflorist.com>, <legoflowerbouquet.com>, <legoflowerbouquets.com>, and <legoflower.shop> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 24, 2025. On October 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 24, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 28, 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 31, 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 November 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 24, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on November 24, 2025, pursuant to which the

Complainant requested suspension of proceedings on November 25, 2025. The Center suspended the proceeding on November 26, 2025. On December 1, 2025, the Center received a request from the Complainant for reinstatement of the proceeding, and the proceeding was accordingly reinstated on December 2, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on December 8, 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 well-known Denmark based company for construction toys and owns numerous trademarks and trade names for LEGO for decades in several jurisdictions around the world. The Complainant has been named a top global brand in multiple rankings and has won industry awards (e.g., “Toy of the Century”), underscoring its fame.

The Complainant owns inter alia the following LEGO trademark registrations:

- the International Trademark Registration for LEGO, No. 287932, registered on August 27, 1964; and
- the United States of America Trademark Registration for LEGO, No. 4395578, registered on September 3, 2013.

The Complainant further owns (amongst many others) the domain name <lego.com> which addresses the official LEGO website.

The Complainant’s product lines now extend beyond toys, notably, it offers a LEGO Botanical Collection featuring buildable flower and plant sets (essentially floral-themed LEGO products).

The Respondent registered the four disputed domain names on June 16, 2025. The disputed domain names have been pointed to pay-per-click (“PPC”) parking pages with sponsored links, some apparently relating to flowers, bouquets, and possibly competitors or unrelated services.

In July 2025, the Complainant attempted to contact the Respondent via a cease-and-desist letter (through the registrar’s contact mechanism), advising that the disputed domain names’ use infringed the Complainant’s rights and requesting transfer for compensation of out-of-pocket costs. The Respondent did not reply to that letter or a follow-up reminder.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- (1) The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LEGO trademark, since they incorporate it in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive terms “florist”, “flower”, and the misspelled term “flowerbouquet(s)” does not prevent confusion. The inclusion of different top-level domains (e.g., “.com”, “.shop”) is irrelevant for confusion analysis.

(2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use the LEGO mark, nor is the Respondent affiliated in any way. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. There is no evidence the Respondent has any trademark rights in LEGO or the combined terms. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names for monetized link pages is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, it is capitalizing on the Complainant's mark to generate click-through revenue, which does not confer any legitimate interest.

(3) The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. LEGO is a famous mark worldwide, and it strains credulity that the Respondent was unaware of it. The timing (decades after LEGO's fame was established) and the registration of multiple "LEGO + flower" disputed domain names indicate the Respondent targeted the Complainant's mark. The use of the disputed domain names for PPC ads confirms bad faith use, and the Respondent is attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's LEGO mark, which fits the example of bad faith. Visitors are likely to assume an affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant and then be diverted to unrelated or competitive sites via sponsored links, from which the Respondent (or the parking service) presumably gains revenue. There is no plausible legitimate reason for the Respondent to register the disputed domain names aside from trading on the LEGO mark's fame.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not provide a formal reply to the Complainant's contentions but submitted several informal email communications during the course of the proceeding. In these communications, the Respondent stated that he had not previously recognized or responded to earlier correspondence from the Complainant or its representatives, explaining that he receives a large volume of unsolicited or fraudulent emails and therefore does not open links or engage with senders he does not immediately recognize. The Respondent further indicated that he has been a long-standing admirer and consumer of the Complainant's products for several decades and described the disputed domain names as reflecting a personal idea to promote or celebrate LEGO-branded floral products, rather than an attempt to exploit the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent also asserted that, at the time of his communications, the disputed domain names had not been actively used for commercial purposes.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (i) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant even though the Respondent failed to submit a Response.

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules directs the Panel to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

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 evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its LEGO mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Each disputed domain name incorporates the LEGO mark in its entirety. The additional terms "florist", "flower", "flowerbouquet", and "flowerbouquets" are dictionary terms relating to flowers or flower sellers (with "bouquet" being an obvious misspelling of "bouquet"). These additions do not negate the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names to the Complainant's LEGO mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well-settled that generic Top-Level Domains (like ".com" or ".shop") are typically ignored when assessing confusing similarity, as they are a technical necessity of domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore 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 page 4 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 names, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the LEGO trademark in any manner.

The Respondent has not used the disputed domain names for any actual business or legitimate content. The only use evidenced is to host parked pages with PPC advertising links (including links potentially related to flowers or other products). Such PPC parking, when done without the trademark owner's consent and capitalizing on a famous mark, is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. Prior UDRP panels have consistently held that using a well-known trademark in a domain to divert users to commercial links (presumably for profit) does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, nor a bona fide use in trade, rather, it is exploitative. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9. Here, Internet users looking for LEGO's official sites could be misled into visiting the disputed domain names registered by the Respondent, only to encounter advertising links. This misdirection for potential profit is the opposite of a legitimate interest.

The Respondent's informal communications do not establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. While the Respondent expresses personal admiration for the Complainant's brand and refers to an idea to promote LEGO-related products, such statements do not demonstrate use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Nor does the Respondent claim to be commonly known by the disputed domain names, or to have received authorization from the Complainant. Apparently, personal affinity with a brand or aspirational plans to collaborate with a trademark owner do not

confer rights or legitimate interests where a domain name incorporates a well-known trademark without authorization.

As such, the Panel finds that the burden of production regarding this element shifts to the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Respondent has not formally replied to the Complainant's contentions, claiming any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

With the evidence on file, 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.

The timing and circumstances of these registrations strongly suggest bad faith intent. LEGO is an internationally famous trademark that had been in use for many decades prior to registration of the disputed domain names. It is implausible that the Respondent coincidentally chose the term "lego" (a coined brand name with no dictionary meaning) in four disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks. The only reasonable inference is that the Respondent was well aware of LEGO's fame and value, and sought to exploit it. Indeed, the Respondent registered multiple LEGO-formative disputed domain names in one day, a pattern that indicates a deliberate targeting of the mark.

Moreover, the Respondent's own statements indicate clear awareness of the Complainant and its LEGO trademark, which he describes as a brand he has admired for decades. This acknowledgment supports a finding that the disputed domain names were registered with knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in bad faith.

As regards bad faith use, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names resolve to websites containing PPC links. The Panel is of the view that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website. In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, this shall be evidence of both the registration and use in bad faith of the disputed domain names for the purposes as set out in paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Although the Respondent asserts that the disputed domain names have not been actively monetized, passive holding of a domain name incorporating a highly distinctive and well-known trademark does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Considering the totality of circumstances, namely a famous mark, multiple disputed domain name registrations, use for commercial gain, failure to respond to the Complainant or within the UDRP proceedings, and attempts to hide identity, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel, therefore, 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 names <legoflorist.com>, <legoflowerbouquet.com>, <legoflowerbouquets.com> and <legoflower.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/

Ganna Prokhorova

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025