

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. sen xiao

Case No. D2025-4876

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is sen xiao, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <legobricksale.com>, <legodiscountshop.com>, <legojapan.com>, <legopromotions.com>, and <lego2025.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 24, 2025 as regards the disputed domain name <legodiscountshop.com>, <legojapan.com>, and <legopromotions.com>. On November 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 25, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 25, 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 December 1, 2025, in which the Complainant requested addition of the disputed domain name <legobricksale.com>, and <lego2025.com> into the proceeding. On December 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the additional disputed domain names. On December 4, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the additional disputed domain names are registered by the Respondent.

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 December 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 24, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on December 5, 2025, December 6, 2025, and December 9, 2025. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on January 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on January 9, 2026. 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 owner of the LEGO trade mark, and all other trade marks used in connection with the LEGO brand of construction toys and other products. Founded in 1932, the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches all over the world which includes five manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals all over the world and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries.

The Complainant has consistently been listed in various brand rankings, indices and directories as one of the top brands in the world and it has won many awards including Global Toy Manufacturer of the Year for 2022-2024.

The LEGO brand is registered as a trade mark in many jurisdictions around the world. These registrations include United States Trade Mark Registration No. 1018875 for LEGO registered on August 26, 1975 (individually and collectively, the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant also owns an extensive portfolio of more than 6,000 domain names incorporating the Trade Mark. Its main websites are at the domain names <lego.com>, and <legoland.com>.

The Respondent, who appears to be based in China, registered the five disputed domain names on August 1, August 6, August 8, August 29 and October 28, 2025. The disputed domain names resolve to websites offering for sale and selling a variety of goods including clothing, hair accessories, and tech products which are not connected to the Complainant (the "Website(s)"). The Complainant's legal representatives sent cease and desist letters to the Respondent via the Registrar on August 20, August 21, August 29 and September 23, 2025. The Respondent did not reply.

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 confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions but sent emails to the Center offering to explore settlement options if the proceeding was suspended.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the terms "discountshop", "Japan", "promotions", "bricksale" and "2025" after the Trade Mark may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these words does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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 any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain names is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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 must have been aware of the Complainant and its Trade Mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. The Trade Mark enjoys an extensive worldwide reputation, and was registered decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain names. In these circumstances, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant or its Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain names.

As stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2:

“Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent’s claim not to have been aware of the complainant’s mark.”

The Panel further notes that the clear absence of any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, coupled with the Respondent’s selection of the disputed domain names without any explanation, constitutes an additional factor supporting a finding of bad-faith registration (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). In the Panel’s view, the disputed domain names fall squarely within the category of cases described therein. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

The Panel also finds that the disputed domain names are being used in bad faith.

The disputed domain names resolve to commercial websites established for the Respondent’s commercial benefit. It is highly likely that Internet users typing the disputed domain names into their browser, or encountering them via a search engine, would be expecting to reach websites operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The disputed domain names are therefore inherently misleading and likely to cause confusion among Internet users, particularly as they incorporate the Complainant’s distinctive Trade Mark.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is seeking to exploit the reputation of the Trade Mark in order to mislead Internet users into visiting the Respondent’s Websites. On the basis of the record, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Websites, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Taking all of the above circumstances into account, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has registered multiple domain names incorporating the Trade Mark, thereby engaging in a pattern of conduct designed to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its Trade Mark in corresponding domain names. This is not an isolated or inadvertent registration but a deliberate course of conduct targeting the Complainant’s mark across multiple domain name registrations. In the absence of any plausible good-faith explanation or legitimate use for these registrations, the Respondent’s conduct can only be understood as abusive within the meaning of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been satisfied.

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 <legobricksale.com>, <legodiscountshop.com>, <legojapan.com>, <legopromotions.com>, and <lego2025.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026