

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**LEGO Holding A/S v. mhmdamyn krvs nzhad**  
**Case No. D2025-5237**

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is mhmdamyn krvs nzhad, India.

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

The disputed domain name <legoverse.shop> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 16, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 17, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Christelle Vaval as the sole panelist in this matter on January 15, 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, LEGO Holding A/S, is a Danish corporation established in 1932. The company operates globally through subsidiaries, branches, and a network comprising five hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites, and over 500 retail stores. Employing approximately 28,500 individuals, LEGO products are distributed in more than 130 countries. The Complainant is a globally renowned company specializing in the design, production, and sale of construction toys and related products.

The Complainant owns the LEGO trademark in multiple jurisdictions, including India Trademark Registration No. 293298 (registered on January 3, 1974), the United States of America Trademark Registration No. 4395578 (registered on September 3, 2013), and Brazil Trademark Registration No. 730130533 (registered on January 16, 1982).

The Complainant owns multiple domain names, including <lego.com> and <legoland.com>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 9, 2025, well after the Complainant's trademarks were registered. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

#### **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 argues that the disputed domain name is:

1. Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant owns the LEGO trademark, registered in multiple jurisdictions. The disputed domain name incorporates the trademark entirely, only adding the term "verse", which does not reduce confusing similarity. The Complainant contends this may mislead Internet users into thinking the disputed domain name is associated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

2. No legitimate rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, holds no relevant trademarks or trade names, and is listed in Whois record as "mhmdamyn krvs nzhad", which does not match the domain. Additionally, the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the LEGO trademark.

3. Registered and used in bad faith

The Respondent did not respond to multiple cease-and-desist letters to resolve the issue. The Complainant asserts that using a domain name with its famous LEGO Trademark, without legitimate intent, demonstrates bad faith and exploits the brand's reputation for personal gain. The actions are seen as misleading and intended to divert consumers for commercial benefit.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

The case record shows the Center verified the Complaint's formal compliance and formally commenced the proceeding on December 18, 2025 (with a 20-day response submission deadline that fell on January 7, 2026). The Respondent did not submit any response. The Center then notified the Respondent of default on January 8, 2026. The record reflects service consistent with the Rules and WIPO Supplemental Rules. In the absence of a response, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (Rules, paragraph 14), as the Center's default notice also notes.

### 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.

The Top-Level Domain ("TLD") at the end of a domain name (here, ".shop") is typically disregarded when assessing confusing similarity. Panels consistently find that the inclusion of a TLD is a standard registration requirement and does not affect the determination of whether a domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "verse", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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.

Given the Complainant's rights to the LEGO trademark, and the fact that the disputed domain name entirely includes this trademark, there is confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

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.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent affiliated with, or authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark. The record shows no evidence of use of or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name by the Respondent for a bona fide offering of goods or services, no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, and no indication that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name (Policy, paragraph 4(c)).

UDRP panels have determined that domain names matching or containing a complainant's trademark along with extra words can imply sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, which presents a risk of assumed sponsorship (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1). In the present case, the disputed domain name fully includes the Complainant's well-known LEGO trademark, and the minor addition of the term "verse" increases the chance of confusion for Internet users by misleadingly suggesting a connection, sponsorship, or endorsement by the Complainant.

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.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 9, 2025, well after the Complainant's trademark had become distinctive and widely recognized. In the present case, the Panel considers that the Respondent more likely than not had knowledge of the Complainant's well-known trademark when registering the disputed domain name <legoverse.shop> and reproduced the Complainant's trademark in its entirety when registering the disputed domain name.

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 the distinctiveness or 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 <legoverse.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christelle Vaval/  
**Christelle Vaval**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 28, 2026