

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Florence Albertini, Souvlego
Case No. D2025-4391

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Florence Albertini, Souvlego, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <souvlego.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 24, 2025. On October 27, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0176243241) 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 Respondent sent email communications to the Center on October 28, 2025, and October 29, 2025, and October 31, 2025. On October 29, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that if they would like to explore settlement options, the Complainant should submit a request for suspension.

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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was November 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. On December 3, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment.

The Center appointed Zeynep Yasaman 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, based in Denmark, 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. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including the United States of America, Canada, and France.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous LEGO trademarks registered in various jurisdictions, including the European Union trademark no. 000039800, registered on October 5, 1998.

The Complainant's primary domain name is <lego.com>, and the Complainant is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark.

The disputed domain name <souvlego.com> was registered on September 23, 2025. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is currently inactive, displaying a "[t]his site can't be reached" message upon attempted access. However, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel observes that the homepage of the website under the disputed domain name previously displayed the LEGO logo at the top center of the page. The navigation bar included sections titled "Accueil" (Homepage), "Catalogue", and "Contact", and offers a currency selector and a language option. A large banner image featured an individual assembling LEGO sets, accompanied by a highlighted box stating "Revente de produits LEGO" (resale of LEGO products) and a "Shop all" button. Below this banner, the site stated "Nous sommes spécialisés dans la revente de sets LEGO neufs" (We are specialized in the resale of new LEGO sets), followed by multiple product listings displaying various LEGO sets such as Bugatti Chiron, Concorde, Croiseur d'Attaque de Classe Venator, and several Ferrari-themed sets, each with pricing information and an "Ajouter au panier" (Add to cart) button. Further down the page, the website featured a customer review section titled "Customers are saying", displaying a five-star rating and a testimonial. At the bottom of the page, the site offered a newsletter subscription field and displayed payment icons (Visa, Mastercard, etc.). The footer included the statement "© 2025 Souvlego – Commerce électronique propulse par Shopify", indicating that the website was built on the Shopify infrastructure.

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 dominant part of 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, and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark LEGO. The Complainant adds that the Respondent's prior use of the disputed

domain name to resolve to a website that claims to offer for sale the Complainant's goods is further evidence that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent may not claim any rights established by common usage. No license or authorization of any other kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent to use the trademark LEGO. Further, the Respondent is not an authorized dealer of the Complainant's products and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that LEGO is a famous trademark worldwide and that any use of such a trademark in a domain name would violate the rights of the trademark owner. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has clearly chosen to impersonate the Complainant in the Whois record of the disputed domain name, attempting to pass off in the registration details, which the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized. Furthermore, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent was using a privacy service, which past panels have also found to equate to a lack of legitimate interest. According to the Complainant, as no evidence has been found that the Respondent is using the name LEGO as a company name or has any other legal rights in the name, it is quite clear that the Respondent is simply trying to benefit from the Complainant's world-famous trademark. Moreover, prior to the Complainant's takedown notice, the Respondent was not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has intentionally chosen a domain name based on a registered trademark in order to generate traffic and income through an unauthorized website offering LEGO products. Specifically, the Respondent had initially made use of the disputed domain name to resolve a website that impersonated the Complainant, though the use of the Complainant's LEGO logotype, while claiming to offer the Complainant's products for sale at high discount prices. The Complainant points out that the Oki Data criteria do not apply in the present case. Moreover, the Respondent has incorporated the Complainant's logotype without consent, to create a false link to the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the Respondent still fails to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as the disputed domain name now resolves to inactive page that lacks content and the Respondent has failed to make use of this disputed domain name's website and has not demonstrated any attempt to make legitimate use of the disputed domain name.

Regarding bad faith use and registration, the Complainant asserts that the trademark LEGO in respect of toys belonging to the Complainant has the status of a well-known and reputable trademark with a substantial and widespread goodwill throughout the world and that the Respondent cannot claim to have been using the LEGO trademark without being aware of the Complainant's rights to it. Since the disputed domain name was previously connected to an unauthorized commercial website offering LEGO products and the Complainant's logotype was prominently displayed on the website masthead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to a website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website. The Complainant argues that even though the disputed domain name has not been actively used now, factors such as confusing similarity and the fact that the Respondent has made no legitimate use of the disputed domain name should be considered in assessing bad faith registration and use. According to the Complainant, the Respondent, at the time of initial filing of the Complaint, had employed a privacy service to hide its identity, which serves as further evidence of bad faith registration and use. The Complainant adds that the fact that the disclosed Whois record of the disputed domain name lists the Registrant Organization as "Souvlego" shows that the Respondent has intentionally provided false details for the purpose of avoiding detection and a means of appearing legitimate. Such falsified information is another indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal Response. By emails sent to the Center, the Respondent explained that the disputed domain name was purchased simply because the Respondent found the name appealing and available. The Respondent indicated that there was no specific intention behind the registration and no awareness of any potential dispute at the time. The Respondent further expressed that it was not their intention for the matter to escalate and stated that they would cease using the domain name, adding an apology for the situation.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the complainant to show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1). In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant owns registered LEGO trademarks. Accordingly, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7).

The Panel notes that the entirety of the Complainant's LEGO trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the term "souv" at the beginning of the Second-Level portion of the disputed domain name and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" 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](#), sections 1.8 and 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. These are as follows:

- (i) before any notice of the dispute, the respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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 that 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 notes that there is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent could be commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of the Policy. Furthermore, the Complainant has clearly established that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant nor authorized or licensed to use the LEGO trademark or register the disputed domain name.

Where a respondent is re-selling a complainant's products or providing services relating to them, then the applicable criteria for determining whether a respondent can assert a right or legitimate interest in a domain name that incorporates the complainant's trademark are set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). To establish a bona fide offering of goods and services, a reseller or distributor of trademarked goods should comply with certain requirements. Outlined in the "Oki Data test", the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case: (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue; (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services; (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark. In the present case, the Panel notes that the website to which the disputed domain name previously resolved was engaged in the "resale of LEGO products" and stated that it was "specialized in the resale of new LEGO sets." The site appears to offer exclusively LEGO-branded products. However, although the Panel is unable to determine whether original branded products of the Complainant were actually being offered for sale on the website under the disputed domain name, even if that were the case, the website contains no disclosure clarifying the nature of the relationship between the trademark owner (the Complainant) and the domain name holder (the Respondent). In other words, the website provides no information or disclaimer regarding the nature of its relationship with the trademark owner, leaving users with no indication as to whether the Respondent is authorised by, affiliated with, or otherwise connected to the Complainant.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not disclosed any relationship with the Complainant, who is the owner of the trademark used in connection with the products offered for sale. Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the LEGO trademark together with the term "souv" which might be seen as referring to "souvenir", together with the use of the Complainant's trademarks on the associated website, gives rise to a misleading impression of affiliation with the Complainant or with an entity duly authorized by the Complainant.

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:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) that the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) that by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other on-line 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.

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.)

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark LEGO enjoys a worldwide reputation. It has been established in previous UDRP decisions that the registration of a domain name incorporating a widely-recognized or well-known trademark by a third party who has no connection with the trademark can by itself create a presumption of bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4). In light of this and the use of the disputed domain name, the Panel concludes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's well-known LEGO trademark at the time of registration and that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

By registering a domain name that combines the Complainant's trademark with the term "souv", and by using it for a website featuring the Complainant's LEGO trademark, in connection with the resale of the Complainant's products without any disclaimer of its lack of relationship with the Complainant, the Panel considers that the Respondent creates a false impression of affiliation. In this regard, the Panel finds 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 trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the products offered therein. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In addition, the Panel notes that the content of the websites under the disputed domain names was removed and the website cannot be accessed. This further supports a finding that the Respondent has no legitimate purpose for holding the disputed domain name and confirms the Respondent's bad faith intent. 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 reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the prior content of the associated website, 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.

Lastly, the Panel also notes that the Respondent provided incorrect or incomplete contact information in the WhoIs register for the disputed domain name since the Written Notice on the Notification of Complaint could not be delivered by the courier service. This supports the Panel's bad faith finding.

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 <souvlego.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zeynep Yasaman/

Zeynep Yasaman

Sole Panelist

Date: December 18, 2025