

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Clercio Nhone
Case No. D2025-4427

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Clercio Nhone, Mozambique.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legomoz.com> is 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 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 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 30, 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 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Nesrine Roudane as the sole panelist in this matter on December 10, 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.

The Panel has reviewed the case file and the evidence submitted, including the annexes to the Complaint.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, LEGO Holding A/S, is a Limited Liability Company headquartered in Denmark. Founded in 1932, the LEGO Group is globally recognized for the design, manufacture, and commercialization of LEGO-branded construction toys and a wide range of related products and services.

As of January 1, 2025, LEGO Juris A/S was renamed LEGO Holding A/S, consolidating under a single corporate entity all LEGO-branded activities and intellectual property rights, including ownership of the LEGO trademarks (Annex 2).

The Complainant operates worldwide through subsidiaries, branches, and licensees, with five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites, and over 500 LEGO retail stores. LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, reflecting the Complainant's longstanding global commercial footprint, including Mozambique, where the Respondent is located (Annex 4). The Complainant also operates extensive online activities, notably through its primary domain name <lego.com>, which receives tens of millions of visits per month (Annexes 7, 8 and 9).

The Complainant is the owner of an extensive and longstanding portfolio of trademark registrations for the marks LEGO, LEGO (logo), and LEGOLAND, covering a very large number of jurisdictions worldwide (Annex 3.1).

These registrations are relied upon collectively to demonstrate the global scope, seniority, and notoriety of the Complainant's trademarks ("LEGO trademarks"). For the purposes of this proceeding, the following trademark registrations are particularly relevant:

- United States of America word mark LEGO, Trademark Registration No. 1018875 registered on August 26, 1975, in class 28;
- International figurative / logo mark LEGO, Trademark Registration No. 869258 registered on November 11, 2005, in classes 9, 16, 25, 28, 41; and
- International word mark LEGOLAND, Trademark Registration No. 397858 registered on March 29, 1973, in classes 9 and 28.

These registrations demonstrate that the Complainant's trademark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name and extend to the jurisdiction where the Respondent is located. They further illustrate the breadth and continuity of protection afforded to the Complainant's LEGO brand worldwide.

In addition to registered rights, the Complainant's LEGO trademarks enjoy exceptional worldwide notoriety and reputation, supported by decades of intensive use, advertising, and commercial success. The Complainant's LEGO brand has repeatedly been recognized as one of the most famous and reputable brands globally, including being named "Toy of the Century" and ranking among the world's most reputable companies (Annex 5). Such extensive recognition further reinforces the distinctiveness and source-identifying function of the LEGO mark.

The Complainant owns and operates more than 6,000 domain names incorporating the LEGO trademark, reflecting a longstanding and proactive domain name protection strategy (Annex 6). The Complainant's principal websites include <lego.com> and <legoland.com>, which are used to promote and sell LEGO products and services worldwide.

The disputed domain name <legomoz.com> was registered on October 10, 2025, long after the Complainant had established extensive trademark rights in the LEGO mark globally and well after the LEGO mark had achieved worldwide recognition (Annex 10).

Prior to the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a commercial website presented as an online shop offering LEGO-branded products. As evidenced by screenshots provided in Annex 11.1, the website prominently displayed the Complainant's LEGO logo, adopted the LEGO red-and-yellow color scheme, and referred explicitly to "LEGO Mozambique," thereby creating the appearance of an official or authorized LEGO website. The website offered LEGO products for sale and mimicked the overall look and feel of the Complainant's official online presence.

Following a takedown request by the Complainant's representatives, the disputed domain name ceased resolving to an active commercial website and, at the time of the Complaint, resolved to an inactive page without substantive content (Annex 11.2). Notwithstanding this inactivity, the disputed domain name remains registered and configured with active Mail eXchanger ("MX") records, suggesting the possibility of email use associated with the domain name (Annex 12).

The Respondent is identified as Clercio Nhone, located in Maputo, Mozambique. At the time of registration, the Respondent used a privacy service (Domains By Proxy, LLC) to conceal its identity, which was later disclosed by the Registrar upon verification (Annex 10).

There is no evidence on record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, holds any trademark or trade name rights corresponding to "LEGO" or "legomoz", or has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the LEGO trademark. No business relationship has ever existed between the Complainant and the Respondent, and no correspondence evidencing authorization or consent has been produced.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name <legomoz.com> is confusingly similar to its well-known LEGO trademark. The dominant and distinctive element of the disputed domain name is the term "LEGO", which is identical to the Complainant's registered trademark. The addition of the suffix "moz" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, the Complainant contends that this suffix is likely to be perceived as a geographic abbreviation referring to Mozambique, thereby increasing the likelihood of confusion by suggesting an official or localized presence of the Complainant. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is irrelevant for the purposes of the confusing similarity assessment.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the LEGO trademark, whether as a domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent is not an authorized dealer, distributor, or reseller of LEGO products, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent cannot rely on any bona fide offering of goods or services, as the disputed domain name was previously used for a website that impersonated the Complainant by prominently displaying the LEGO logo, adopting the Complainant's distinctive color scheme, and presenting itself as "LEGO Mozambique", while offering LEGO products for sale without authorization. Such use, according to the Complainant, is inherently misleading and cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant emphasizes the worldwide fame and longstanding reputation of the LEGO trademark, which long predates the registration of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the LEGO trademark at the time of registration. The Complainant argues that the Respondent intentionally registered the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The prior use of the disputed domain name for an unauthorized commercial website offering LEGO products, combined with the imitation of the Complainant's official website and branding, is relied upon as clear evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's subsequent passive holding of the disputed domain name does not preclude a finding of bad faith, particularly given the strength of the LEGO trademark, the absence of any plausible good-faith use, and the continued configuration of MX records, which may facilitate deceptive email communications. The Complainant also notes that the Respondent initially used a privacy service to conceal its identity, which, in the circumstances of this case, further supports a finding of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit any response to the Complaint and did not otherwise contest the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel has reviewed the record, including the Complaint, the annexes submitted by the Complainant, and the applicable provisions of the Policy, the Rules, and the WIPO Supplemental Rules.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to prevail, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that each of the following three elements is satisfied:

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

The Panel notes that the Respondent did not submit a Response in this proceeding. In accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may therefore draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate. However, the Complainant must still establish each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is English. Accordingly, pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Rules, the language of the proceeding is English.

The Panel will now address each of the elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in turn, with reference to the factual background, the parties' contentions, and relevant UDRP jurisprudence, including the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element of the Policy 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. See 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 notes that the Complainant has established registered trademark rights in the LEGO mark through multiple longstanding registrations worldwide, including registrations that significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. These rights are supported by extensive evidence submitted in the Complaint, including trademark registration certificates and portfolio listings.

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.

The disputed domain name <legomoz.com> incorporates the Complainant's LEGO trademark in its entirety. The additional term "moz" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "moz") may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) (".com") is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests with the complainant, panels have consistently recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests may involve the difficult task of "proving a negative", as the relevant information is often within the respondent's control. Accordingly, where a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy. [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, whether under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise.

In particular:

- There is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the LEGO trademark in any manner.
- There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any name corresponding to "LEGO" or "legomoz".
- There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The record shows that, prior to notice of the dispute, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that prominently displayed the Complainant's LEGO trademark and logo, adopted the Complainant's distinctive red-and-yellow color scheme, referred expressly to "LEGO Mozambique", and offered LEGO-branded products for sale. The overall presentation of the website created the impression of an official or authorized LEGO online store. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation / passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Even where a respondent claims to be a reseller or distributor of genuine goods, panels apply the criteria set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), as summarized in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1. All of the following conditions must be met:

- the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods;
- the site must accurately and prominently disclose the respondent's relationship (or lack thereof) with the trademark holder; and
- the respondent must not attempt to corner the market in domain names reflecting the trademark.

In the present case, the Respondent fails the Oki Data test. In particular, the Respondent did not accurately disclose the lack of any relationship with the Complainant. On the contrary, by presenting the website as "LEGO Mozambique", reproducing the LEGO logo, and mimicking the look and feel of the Complainant's official website, the Respondent falsely suggested affiliation, sponsorship, or authorization by the Complainant.

Panels have consistently found that such impersonation or passing off defeats any claim to rights or legitimate interests, even where genuine products may be involved.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name no longer resolved to an active website. However, panels have consistently held that the mere passive holding of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark does not, by itself, establish rights or legitimate interests, particularly where there is no evidence of any good faith use or demonstrable preparations for such use.

In light of the above, and in the absence of any rebuttal by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that 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 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 both registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, for the reasons set out below.

The LEGO trademark is a globally well-known and highly distinctive mark, enjoying longstanding protection and reputation worldwide, including in Africa and Mozambique. Given the notoriety of the LEGO mark and its extensive use well predating the registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

The disputed domain name <legomoz.com> incorporates the LEGO mark in its entirety, combined with the term "moz", which the Panel finds is a clear reference to Mozambique, the Respondent's location, which increase the likelihood of confusion by suggesting a localized or official presence of the Complainant in Mozambique, rather than distinguishing the disputed domain name from the LEGO trademark. This composition strongly supports a finding of deliberate targeting, rather than coincidence.

Furthermore, panels have consistently held that the incorporation of a famous trademark into a domain name, without authorization and without any plausible explanation, is in itself indicative of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a commercial website that:

- prominently displayed the LEGO logo;
- adopted the Complainant's red-and-yellow color scheme;
- referred explicitly to "LEGO Mozambique"; and
- offered claimed LEGO-branded products for sale.

The Panel finds that this use constituted a clear case of impersonation and passing off, intentionally designed to mislead Internet users into believing that the website was operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including impersonation or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests and constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.13.1 and 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent 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 source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Following a takedown request by the Complainant, the disputed domain name ceased resolving to an active website and currently resolves to an inactive page. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes in particular:

- the distinctive and well-known character of the LEGO mark;
- the absence of any plausible legitimate use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent;
- the prior active bad-faith use of the disputed domain name; and
- the Respondent's failure to submit any Response or explanation.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

At the time of registration, the Respondent employed a privacy service to conceal its identity. While the use of privacy services is not inherently illegitimate, in the present case it reinforces the inference of bad faith, particularly in light of the Respondent's impersonation conduct and lack of any legitimate explanation.

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 <legomoz.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nesrine Roudane/

Nesrine Roudane

Sole Panelist

Date: December 24, 2025