

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. 苏科 (suke, su ke)

Case No. D2025-5242

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 苏科 (suke, su ke), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lego-salestore.com> is registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English 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 disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 18, 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 in English on December 19, 2025.

On December 18, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On December 19, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Xu Lin as the sole panelist in this matter on January 20, 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

Founded in 1932 and based on the iconic LEGO brick, the Complainant is one of the world's leading manufacturers of play materials. It is a privately held company headquartered in Billund, Denmark. The Complainant's products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in China.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for LEGO in multiple jurisdictions, including:

- International trademark LEGO, No. 287932, registered on August 27, 1964, in Class 28;
- Danish trademark LEGO, No. VR 1954 00604, registered on May 1, 1954, in Class 28;
- Chinese trademark LEGO, No. 75682, registered on December 22, 1976, in Class 28.

The Complainant owns the domain name <lego.com>, registered in 1995, which it uses to promote its products and share brand-related content worldwide.

The Respondent is an individual based in China.

The disputed domain name <lego-salestore.com> was registered on August 28, 2025. According to the Complainant's evidence, the disputed domain name was used to host a website with the Complainant's LEGO logo, purportedly offering the LEGO products for sale. It currently resolves to inactive page and does not host any active content.

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:

Firstly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LEGO trademark:

- The LEGO trademark's fame and distinctiveness have been repeatedly affirmed in multiple prior UDRP decisions.
- The hyphen and the generic term "salestore" added to the disputed domain name do not reduce such confusing similarity. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not have any impact on the overall impression of the dominant portion of the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name further contributes to the confusion between the disputed domain name and the LEGO trademark. Prior to a takedown notice sent by the Complainant's representatives, the disputed domain name was used to host a website that utilized the Complainant's LEGO logo while claiming to offer the Complainant's products for sale.

Secondly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name:

- There is no evidence of the Respondent holding registered trademarks/trade names matching the disputed domain name, nor any lawful use of the LEGO mark that could establish such rights.

- The Complainant has not licensed the Respondent to use the LEGO trademark, and the Respondent has no authorization from, nor any business relationship with the Complainant.
- LEGO is a famous trademark worldwide and it was established in a prior case that any use of such a trademark in a domain name would violate the rights of the trademark owner.
- No evidence, including the Registrant's name in the Whois record, suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's use of a privacy Whois service has been deemed by prior UDRP panels as indicative of a lack of legitimate interest.
- The Respondent had initially made use of the disputed domain name to resolve a website that impersonated the Complainant through the use of the Complainant's LEGO logo, while claiming to offer the Complainant's products for sale. The Respondent selected the disputed domain name to exploit the fame of the Complainant's LEGO trademark rather than for bona fide purposes, and fails to meet the Oki Data Test (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)).
- The disputed domain name now resolves to an inactive page that lacks content. The Respondent has never made a bona fide offering of goods or services via the disputed domain name, and its current use further confirms a lack of legitimate interest.

Finally, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith:

- The Complainant's LEGO trademark for toys is a world-famous, reputable mark with extensive global goodwill and high recognition in the community, and this fame and value is the clear motivation for the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 28, 2025, decades after the Complainant registered the LEGO trademark in China, the United States of America, and other jurisdictions. The Respondent could not have registered the disputed domain name without being aware of the Complainant's trademark rights, and the incorporation of this well-known trademark into the disputed domain name without plausible explanation is itself an indication of bad faith.
- The Respondent previously used the disputed domain name to host an unauthorized commercial website featuring the Complainant's LEGO logo, creating confusion to attract Internet users for commercial gain. This constitutes bad faith registration and use under UDRP Policy.
- Though the disputed domain name now resolves to an inactive page with no active use by the Respondent, UDRP precedents confirm that passive holding of an infringing domain name constitutes bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that

- The Complainant is unable to communicate in Chinese and translation of the Complaint would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter. Such delay poses a continuing risk to Complainant and unsuspecting consumers seeking Complainant or its products.
- The Respondent registered a Latin-character disputed domain name (with the dominant term "lego" having no Chinese meaning, and the terms "sale" and "store" being English words) which misappropriates

the famous LEGO mark, and previously used an all-English website linked to this disputed domain name to sell the Complainant's products.

The Respondent has not challenged the Complainant's language request and in fact has failed to file a response in either English or Chinese despite being duly notified by the Center in both English and Chinese of the language of the proceeding and of the commencement of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 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 a hyphen and other term "salestore" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

In what concerns the addition of the gTLD ".com" in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Complainant has not granted any license or right to the Respondent to use its LEGO trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The evidence submitted by the Complainant indicates that the disputed domain name previously resolves to an unauthorized commercial website prominently displaying the Complainant's LEGO mark, and purportedly offering LEGO products. Further, the disputed domain name includes the Complainant's LEGO Trademark in its entirety, and the additional term "salestore" would be easily interpreted as indicating that the disputed domain name leads to an official sale store of the Complainant's LEGO products.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive or inaccessible page and does not host any active content. Such use cannot qualify as a bona fide offer of goods or services, nor does it amount to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LEGO trademark in this manner is likely to cause confusion among Internet users, and cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent 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 notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant's LEGO trademark had achieved global fame and reputation, and therefore very likely did so deliberately. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the well-known and earlier registered LEGO Trademark, is a clear indication of bad faith.

Moreover, the disputed domain name was previously connected to an unauthorized commercial website on which the Complainant's LEGO logo was prominently displayed, contributing to the creation of a false impression that it was operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. This conduct clearly reflects an intention to take a free ride on the Complainant's well-established mark and to generate traffic and income through an unauthorized website offering LEGO products, directly reflecting the intent to mislead consumers and obtain unfair commercial advantage contemplated under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

The Respondent is currently passively holding the disputed domain name which cannot prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and lack of response, and the prior use of the disputed domain name in connection with the above-

mentioned website, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current 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 <lego-salestore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Xu Lin/

Xu Lin

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026