

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. GIUSEPPE ADAMO, ADAM LEGO
Case No. D2025-4705

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is GIUSEPPE ADAMO, ADAM LEGO, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adamlego.store> is registered with Tucows.com Co. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 13, 2025. On November 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 14, 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 0176182059) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 17, 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 18, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Petra Pecar as the sole panelist in this matter on December 15, 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 (hereinafter “the Complainant”), founded in 1932 in Denmark and formerly known as LEGO Juris A/S as of January 1, 2025, has unified all formal LEGO branded activities and related rights under one governance structure. The Complainant is the owner of the LEGO mark and is responsible for all LEGO brand operations worldwide, including the development, manufacture, marketing, and sale of LEGO construction toys and related products, as well as the expansion of the LEGO brand into digital content, software, books, and other branded merchandise.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple worldwide registrations bearing the term LEGO, including, inter alia, the following registrations in the United States of America:

- the LEGO word mark, Registration No. 4.395.578, registered on September 3, 2013, for goods in International Classes 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 28;
- the LEGO word mark, Registration No. 2.245.652, registered on May 18, 1999, for goods in International Class 28;
- the LEGO word mark, Registration No. 1.018.875, registered on August 26, 1975, for goods in International Class 28;
- the figurative mark  ,Registration No. 2.060.284, registered on May 13, 1997, for goods in International Classes 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 25, 28, 41, and 42; and
- the figurative mark  ,Registration No. 1.026.871, registered on December 9, 1975, for goods in International Class 28.

The Complainant holds rights in more than 6,000 LEGO related domain names, among other online presence operating the official website on domain name <lego.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 16, 2025, and initially resolved to a webpage offering for sale the Complainant’s LEGO Death Star model set at a significant discount. At the time of the Complaint’s filing, it resolved to an inactive webpage.

The Respondent is an individual residing within the United States of America.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the well-known LEGO mark, as LEGO constitutes its dominant and distinctive element, and neither the addition of the prefix “adam” nor the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.store” is sufficient to negate or otherwise attenuate the similarity. The Complainant further maintains that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to offer LEGO products for sale demonstrates an intention to exploit the reputation of the LEGO trademark and to create a misleading impression of affiliation.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has never been authorized to use the LEGO mark, and has no relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant states that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name to take advantage of the reputation of the LEGO mark. Before the takedown request, the Respondent used the disputed domain name for an unauthorised website offering LEGO products, specifically the LEGO Death Star, at a significant discount, without any disclosure of the lack of affiliation and with elements suggesting a false association. At the time of the Complaint filing, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage, showing no legitimate use. The Complainant argues that both the earlier misleading use and the current inactivity demonstrate that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that LEGO is a well-known and reputable mark with substantial worldwide goodwill, as evidenced by the numerous cases the Complainant has had to pursue against unauthorized domain names incorporating its LEGO mark. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant had registered its LEGO mark, indicating that the registration was motivated by the recognition and value of the LEGO mark. Before the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an unauthorized commercial website offering LEGO products at a discounted price and using similar branding, creating a likelihood of confusion for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainant's contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

"A Panel shall decide a 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", as indicated in paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

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 LEGO 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 as prefix “adam”, recognized as personal name, 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.

Furthermore, it is well accepted practice by UDRP panels that a gTLD, such as “.store”, is typically ignored when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark (see section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0).

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 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.

According to the Complainant, it appears that the Respondent is not affiliated or connected with the Complainant in any manner, nor has the Complainant granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant's LEGO marks. The Respondent has also failed to respond to the Complaint, thereby failing to provide any information or factors that could potentially establish prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Furthermore, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has engaged in any legitimate or bona fide use of the disputed domain name, either for commercial or noncommercial purposes, as the disputed domain name, at the time the Complaint was filed, resolves to an inactive webpage. Instead, the Complainant has presented evidence linking the disputed domain name to a prior use of the website for offering items associated with the LEGO brand at significantly discounted prices, which further supports a determination that the Respondent has no legitimate rights or interests in the disputed domain name.

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 observes that the disputed domain name consists of a combination of the prefix “adam”, the Complainant’s LEGO mark, and the gTLD “.store”. The addition of “adam”, a personal name, functions only as a non-distinctive prefix and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The LEGO mark enjoys a very high level of public recognition, which is evident from its longstanding global use, the substantial goodwill associated with it, and the repeated attempts by third parties to register domain names incorporating LEGO together with other terms. Such consistent targeting confirms that the LEGO mark is widely known and has considerable attraction for domain name registrants seeking to benefit from its reputation.

With regard to bad faith, the Panel finds that the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant’s rights. The disputed domain name had previously resolved to a website offering LEGO products at discounted prices, including a LEGO Death Star set, and presenting them in a manner intended to appear as if they originated from or were authorized by the Complainant, including through the use of a similar logotype. Such use demonstrates an intentional effort to create an association with the Complainant and to exploit the reputation of the LEGO mark for commercial gain. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

As regards the current non-use of the disputed domain name, 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 distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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.

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 <adamlego.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Petra Pecar/
Petra Pecar
Sole Panelist
Date: December 29, 2025