

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**LEGO Holding A/S v. Michel Sang, LEGOMANIA?**

**Case No. D2025-4426**

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Michel Sang, LEGOMANIA ?, France.

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

The disputed domain name <legomania.shop> 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 28, 2025. On October 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 28, 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 0176335424) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 29, 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 November 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on November 27, 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 Danish owner of the global Lego construction toy business with products sold in more than 130 countries, including in the European Union. Based on the incorporation documents submitted with the Complaint the Complainant changed its name from LEGO Juris A/S in January 2025 to bring together all of its brands and activities under one governance structure.

Based on the brand recognition evidence submitted by the Complainant the LEGO brand is one of the most recognised brands globally. The Complainant owns numerous trade mark registrations internationally for its LEGO word mark, including in particular European Union trade mark registration no. 000039800 registered on October 5, 1998. It also owns close to 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO mark and operates an extensive website for its business at the domain name <lego.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 4, 2025 and originally resolved to a website which featured the Complainant's LEGO mark and logo and offered for sale the Complainant's LEGO products. Subsequently the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive "Shopify" landing page which states "This store does not exist".

#### **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.

The Complainant submits that it owns registered trade mark rights for its LEGO mark which it says is one of the best-known marks in the world and which has been recognised as such by a number of organisations that review brands and corporate reputation. It notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the LEGO mark and is therefore confusingly similar to its mark. It submits that the addition of the word "mania" does not detract from the overall impression of the mark given by the incorporation of the LEGO mark and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that it has given no licence or authorisation of any kind to the Respondent to use the LEGO trade mark and that the Respondent is not an authorised dealer of the Complainant's products and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant. It says that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant says further that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but instead has intentionally chosen the disputed domain name based on the Complainant's LEGO registered trade mark for its own commercial benefit in order to divert Internet users to its own website which originally featured the LEGO word mark and logo, which had a similar look and feel to the Complainant's website and which appeared to offer for sale the Complainant's products. The Complainant notes that the website at the disputed domain name had no disclaimer confirming that the Respondent was not an authorised re-seller, or that the website was not sponsored, endorsed or approved in any way by the Complainant. Although the website at the disputed domain name now diverts to an inactive Shopify landing page that states "This store does not exist", the Complainant says that this does not amount to a legitimate use of the disputed domain name and evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

In terms of registration in bad faith, the Complainant says that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on October 4, 2025, which is subsequent to the date on which the Complainant registered the trade mark LEGO in the European Union (where the France based Respondent resides) and elsewhere by many years. The Complainant submits that it is obvious that it is the fame of the LEGO trade mark that has motivated the Respondent to register the disputed domain name and that the Respondent cannot claim to have been using the LEGO trade mark, without being aware of the Complainant's rights to it.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy in an intentional attempt to attract Internet users to its 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. It submits that the disputed domain name confuses Internet users looking for the Complainant's website into being diverted to a website which features the LEGO mark and logo, looks like the Complainant's LEGO websites and offers LEGO products for sale, all for the Respondent's commercial benefit. This, says the Complainant, fulfills the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and amounts to evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

The Complainant further says that the fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive landing page amounts to a passive holding, which in the circumstances of its unauthorised use of the very well-known LEGO mark in the disputed domain name and the lack of indication that the Respondent has made any legitimate use of the disputed domain name, amounts to use in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **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 entirety of the mark 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 here, "mania" 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 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.

The Complainant has submitted that it has given no licence or authorisation of any kind to the Respondent to use the LEGO trade mark and that the Respondent is not an authorised dealer of the Complainant's products and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant. It has asserted that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has further submitted that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but instead has intentionally chosen the disputed domain name based on the Complainant's LEGO registered trade mark, for its own commercial benefit, in order to divert Internet users to its own website which originally featured the LEGO word mark and logo, which had a similar look and feel to the Complainant's website and which appeared to offer for sale the Complainant's products. The Complainant has noted that the website at the disputed domain name had no disclaimer confirming that the Respondent was not an authorised re-seller and that the website was not sponsored, endorsed or approved in any way by the Complainant. Although the website at the disputed domain name now diverts to an inactive Shopify landing page that states "This store does not exist", the Complainant has submitted that this does not amount to a legitimate use of the disputed domain name and evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

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 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 registered the disputed domain name on October 4, 2025, which is subsequent to the date on which the Complainant registered the trade mark LEGO in the European Union (where the France based Respondent resides) and elsewhere by many years. The LEGO mark is distinctive and extremely well-reputed globally and in circumstances that the disputed domain name at first resolved to a website that featured the LEGO mark and logo and in general appeared to be conceived to confuse Internet users into thinking that it was the Complainant's website or was authorised by it, then the Panel finds that it is more than likely that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's LEGO mark and business at the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's trade mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name intentionally to confuse and divert Internet users to its website at the disputed domain name for its own financial gain. The Panel finds that there is evidence on the record that the disputed domain name was formerly used to confuse Internet users looking for the Complainant's website into being diverted to a website which featured the LEGO mark and logo, looked like the Complainant's LEGO website and offered LEGO products for sale. It is apparent that this was calculated to be for the Respondent's commercial benefit and it therefore fulfills the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and amounts to evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Subsequently the disputed domain name has resolved to an inactive "Shopify" landing page.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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 again the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trade mark, and finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name on the "Shopify landing page does not prevent a finding of 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 name <legomania.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Alistair Payne/  
Alistair Payne  
Sole Panelist  
Date: December 11, 2025*