

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Truong Tuan Tu, Truong Tuan Tu
Case No. D2026-0145

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Truong Tuan Tu, Truong Tuan Tu, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <5broslego.click> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 14, 2026. On January 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 16, 2026, 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 (GMO-Z.com RUNSYSTEM, GMO-Z.com RUNSYSTEM JSC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 16, 2026, 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 January 20, 2026.

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 January 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Qiang Ma as the sole panelist in this matter on February 16, 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 a Danish toy company famous for its colorful interlocking plastic bricks. Founded in 1932 by Ole Kirk Kristiansen, the name “LEGO” comes from the Danish phrase “leg godt”, meaning “playing well”. Currently, the Complainant is one of the world’s leading toy companies, owning subsidiaries and branches throughout the world, including five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites, and over 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals, and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries and regions, including Viet Nam and the United States of America (“United States”). On January 1, 2025, the Complainant changed the name from LEGO Juris A/S to LEGO Holding A/S and consolidated all rights and licenses to the LEGO brand.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of LEGO trademark registrations, including but not limited to the Viet Nam combined mark LEGO, registered on March 14, 2005 and designated for International Classes 9, 16, 20, 25, 28, and 41 (Registration No. 4-0060988-000), the United States combined mark LEGO, registered on May 13, 1997 and designated for International Classes 30, 41, 9, 18, 6, 28, 16, 14, 25, 24, 10, 21, 20, and 42 (Registration No. 2060284), and the Denmark figurative mark LEGO, registered on May 1, 1954 and designated for International Class 28 (Registration No. VR195400604).

Moreover, the Complainant has evidenced ownership of a vast number of domain names relating to the LEGO trademark, including, inter alia, the domain name <lego.com>, which resolves to the Complainant’s official website at “www.lego.com” and is used to promote the Complainant’s LEGO toy products and related services worldwide.

The Respondent, according to the disclosed Whois information for the disputed domain name, is located in Viet Nam. The disputed domain name was registered on November 5, 2025. As of the time of rendering this Decision, it resolves to a fraudulent website which is set up in the Vietnamese language and offers LEGO toy products without any authorization from the Complainant. The website prominently displays the Complainant’s official LEGO logo and product images. A statement displayed on the webpage describes “5BROSLEGO” (translated from Vietnamese to English) as “the world’s leading authentic LEGO building toys”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LEGO trademark, which is fully incorporated therein. The addition of the terms “5” and “bros” does not diminish the overall impression of confusing similarity. Likewise, the inclusion of the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.click” has no impact on the dominant portion of the disputed domain name and is therefore irrelevant. Furthermore, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to host a website that offers the Complainant’s LEGO products for sale, indicating that the Respondent intends to exploit the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark to foster consumer confusion. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is clearly confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

In addition, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent holds no similar registered trademarks or trade names, and the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use the LEGO trademark. The Respondent has also utilized a privacy Whois service and makes no indication on the website of any relationship with the Complainant. As such, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name appears to be aimed at seeking unfair commercial gain, and the Respondent has no legitimate rights or interests in the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant's LEGO trademark is globally well-known in connection with toy products, a status that has been consistently recognized in numerous prior UDRP decisions. The Complainant's trademark registrations and use also extend to Viet Nam, where the Respondent is located. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an unauthorized commercial website offering LEGO products. This demonstrates that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Therefore, the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "5bros", 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.

Specifically, the term "5bros" is likely to be understood by consumers as "five brothers" and appears to be descriptive in nature, particularly in relation to the toy products offered by both parties. In addition, ".click" is a TLD and is generally disregarded in the assessment of similarity under the Policy. Therefore, the addition of such elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks.

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 3.1](#), 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.

Firstly, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name or any similar name. The Respondent has neither acquired nor applied for any trademark rights in “LEGO” or “5broslego”. Moreover, the Respondent’s name does not resemble the disputed domain name, nor is it used as a company name. Based on the foregoing, it can reasonably be concluded that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the Respondent does not appear to be making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or tarnish the Complainant’s trademark. In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial online sales website offering LEGO products. It is therefore evident that the Respondent has failed to demonstrate any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods and services. As evidenced by the Complainant, the Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any capacity, and the Complainant does not engage in any activities with or maintain any business relationship with the Respondent. Nevertheless, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to host a website that effectively impersonates the Complainant by displaying the Complainant’s distinctive LEGO logo and official product images. The Respondent even describes itself as a provider of authentic LEGO toy products. Accordingly, the Respondent has made no bona fide offering of goods or services and lacks any legitimate 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 notes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. Specifically, the Complainant’s LEGO trademark is distinctive and has achieved worldwide fame in connection with toy products. The Complainant has continuously used the trademark in commerce, including through its official website, and operates the domain name <lego.com> to promote and sell products under the said trademark. In light of these facts, the Respondent’s subsequent registration of the disputed domain name, which fully incorporates the Complainant’s LEGO trademark and resolves to an online sales store purportedly offering Complainant’s LEGO products, constitutes clear evidence of bad faith registration and use.

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 <5broslego.click> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Qiang Ma/

Qiang Ma

Sole Panelist

Date: March 2, 2026