

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Zurabi Ediberidze
Case No. D2025-4392

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Zurabi Ediberidze, Georgia, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lulego.com>, <lulego.me>, <lulego.net>, <lulego.shop>, and <lulego.store> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (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 names. On October 27, 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 31, 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 November 3, 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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 30, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on November 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Haig Oghigian as the sole panelist in this matter on December 12, 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, LEGO Holding A/S, is a Danish company specialized in construction toys and related products. Founded in 1932, the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including: five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals and its products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in the United States of America ("United States") and Georgia.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LEGO , such as but not limited to:

Trademark	Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date
LEGO	United States	1018875	26-08-1975
LEGO	Denmark	604-1954	30-10-1953
LEGO	Georgia	5364	28-05-1997

The Complainant operates its website at "www.lego.com" and others.

The disputed domain names were registered on April 28, 2025.

The Respondent is located in Georgia. The Respondent operated web shops at the disputed domain names, offering the sale of a variety of construction toys.

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:

-The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LEGO, which have been recognized as well-recognized by UDRP panels in multiple proceedings. The Complainant states that the relevant trademark, LEGO is reproduced in the disputed domain names, and therefore the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the LEGO mark. The Complainant submits that the LEGO trademark is fully reproduced in the disputed domain names and as the prefix "lu" is a generic prefix and does not detract from the overall impression. The Complainant adds that addition of this prefix does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, and that because the Respondent was using the disputed domain names to offer goods for sale which are competitive with the Complainant, the risk of confusion among consumers is greater.

-The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant argues that as it has demonstrated rights to the mark contained within the disputed domain names, and has never licensed mark to the Respondent meaning that the Respondent cannot have used the mark with permission. The Complainant further states that there is no record of the Respondent being

commonly known by any terms contained in the disputed domain names, and as such the Respondent would have no reason to choose such a name unless the Respondent was seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant, or its marks, given the established renown of the Complainant. The Complainant further adds that the Respondent was using the disputed domain names to offer products which were competitive with the Complainant's products, in some cases direct copies using images from the Complainant, at a heavily discounted price; and this activity both demonstrates the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names in a manner which does not constitute bona fide use.

-The disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's mark, while having no relationship to that mark even though the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant due to its established brand, global recognition and numerous trademark registrations, and therefore constitutes bad faith registration. The Complainant further demonstrated that the Respondent was using the disputed domain names to offer products which were competitive with the Complainant's products, in some cases direct copies using images from the Complainant, at a heavily discounted price, which shows clear bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

-The disputed domain names are not identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Respondent argues that the disputed domain names are not confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks, as the prefix "lu" changes both the pronunciation and meaning, creating a distinct term. The Respondent states that "LULEGO" is an original coined word created from the phrase: LU – Lucky Builds; LE – Learn Every Day; GO – Go Explore, and therefore is distinct from the Complainant's mark. The Respondent adds that the website which the disputed domain names resolve to contain this unique "LULEGO" brand identity, and therefore cannot be seen as confusingly similar.

-The Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent argues that the disputed domain names were used lawfully, as a genuine, e-commerce site without claims of affiliation with the Complainant or use of the Complainant's marks; which therefore qualifies as a bona fide offering of goods under the Policy.

-The disputed domain names were not registered or used in bad faith.

The Respondent states that the disputed domain names were registered for a lawful business, without the intention to mislead. The Respondent argues that the use of original branding further supports the good faith registration and use of the disputed domain names.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "lu") 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 Top Level Domain ("TLDs") ".com", ".me", ".net", ".shop" and ".store" are viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

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 names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Respondent argued that it was using the disputed domain names for a bona fide offering, however the record demonstrated the Respondent had used the disputed domain names to sell copies of the Complainant's products, at times using images taken from the Complainant's own websites, and competing brick building sets, which does not constitute bona fide use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.2.

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 demonstrated bad faith conduct by intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the

Complainant's mark. As stated in the findings on the first element, the Complainant's mark being recognizable in the disputed domain names on its own is not enough to find in favour of the Complainant. The use of the disputed domain names to host a site offers for sale products directly competitive with the Complainant's own products, many of which are copies of the Complainant's own products offered at a heavily discounted price, does however clearly demonstrate bad faith conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <lulego.com>, <lulego.me>, <lulego.net>, <lulego.shop>, and <lulego.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Haig Oghigian/

Haig Oghigian

Sole Panelist

Date: December 26, 2025