

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Lucas Gonçalves, Julia Sabino, Ana Paula Santos, and Jivanilda Silva

Case No. D2026-0378

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Lucas Gonçalves, Julia Sabino, Ana Paula Santos, and Jivanilda Silva, Brazil.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <legostorebr.online>, <legostorebr.store>, <legostorybr.site>, <legostrangerthings.site>, and <strangerthingslego.shop> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 29, 2026. On January 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 2, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrants and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named respondent (Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 3, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 6, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on March 6, 2026.

The Center appointed David Stone as the sole panelist in this matter on March 13, 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 was founded in 1932 and is based in Denmark. It is the owner of the LEGO famous trademark, and all other trademarks used in connection with LEGO construction toys and other LEGO-branded products.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following registered trademarks for LEGO (the “Mark”):

- LEGO: Brazil trademark registration no. 730130533 registered on January 16, 1982 in international class 28;
- LEGO: European Union trademark registration no. 39800 registered on October 5, 1998 in international classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 20, 24, 25, 28, 38, 41, 42; and
- LEGO: United States of America trademark registration no. 4395578 registered on September 3, 2013 in international classes 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25 and 28.

The Complainant owns more than 6,000 domain names containing the Mark. The Complainant maintains extensive websites at the domain names <lego.com> and <legoland.com>.

The disputed domain names were created between December 2, 2025, and December 6, 2025. The Complainant has provided evidence that previously:

- the disputed domain name <legostorybr.site> displayed prominently the Mark in the form of the Complainant’s logo; and
- the disputed domain name <strangerthingslego.shop> sold construction toys under the Mark and displayed a statement in Portuguese translating as “Shop Comercial LTDA is the official partner for the licensed LEGO Group website in Brazil”.

At the time of filing of the Complaint and the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites.

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.

The Complainant contends, under the first element, that it is the owner of the Mark, which is well-known and comprises the dominant part of the disputed domain names. In relation to the disputed domain names <legostrangerthings.site> and <strangerthingslego.shop>, the Complainant contends that each incorporates

the Mark in its entirety (combined with the third-party trademark STRANGER THINGS) and that these disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Mark.

Under the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondents hold no registered trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain names and that nothing suggests that the Respondents have used the Mark in any way that would give rise to legitimate rights in the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that it has granted the Respondents no licence or authorisation of any kind to use the Mark. The Complainant contends that the Respondents intentionally registered disputed domain names incorporating the LEGO trademark and the third-party STRANGER THINGS trademark in order to generate traffic and income through unauthorised websites offering LEGO products.

Further, the Complainant contends that there is no disclaimer on the websites to which two of the disputed domain names previously resolved that disavow any endorsement or sponsorship by the Complainant. The Complainant contends that, to the contrary, a statement was displayed at the bottom of each website to which the disputed domain names previously resolved: for <legostorybr.site>, a disclaimer reading “2025 LEGO, Todos os direitos reservados” (translating from Portuguese as “2025 LEGO, All rights reserved”); and for <strangerthingslego.shop>, a statement in Portuguese translating as “Shop Comercial LTDA is the official partner for the licensed LEGO site in Brazil”. The Complainant also contends that, in respect of the disputed domain name <legostorybr.site>, the Respondents incorporated the Complainant's logo on the associated website without consent, to create a false association with the Complainant. The Complainant contends that this conduct evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and that the Respondents are seeking to benefit from the Complainant's Mark.

The Complainant contends, under the third element, that domain name registrations comprising the Mark in combination with other words have always been attractive to domain name infringers. The fame of the trademark motivated the Respondents to register the disputed domain names and the Respondents cannot claim to have been using the Mark, without being aware of the Complainant's rights to it. The Respondents' previous use of the disputed domain names <legostorybr.site> and <strangerthingslego.shop> constitutes a disruption of the Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use because the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain names were being used to offer the Complainant's goods without the Complainant's authorization or approval. The disputed domain names can only be taken as intending to cause confusion among Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain names, and thus, the disputed domain names must be considered as having been registered and used in bad faith. Further, the Complainant contends that, by passively holding the disputed domain names, the Respondents are not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that: (i) four of the five disputed domain names are registered through a privacy service with Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org), while the fifth domain name <strangerthingslego.shop> does not list the registrant's details; (ii) the disputed domain names were all registered between December 2, 2025 and December 6, 2025, and through the Registrar Hostinger Operations, UAB; (iii) the disputed domain names <legostorebr.online> and <legostorebr.store> were registered on the same day, December 4, 2025; (iv) all the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve are no longer displaying content, however the disputed domain names <legostorybr.site> and <strangerthingslego.shop> were previously resolving to commercial content impersonating the Complainant; (v) all five disputed domain names are hosted on the same servers with dns-parking.com; (vi) all registrants are located in Brazil, with two specifically in the state of Bahia; (vii) all registrants share generic email addresses using either <gmail.com> or <tuamaequelaursa.com>, the latter of which is a disposable email service; (viii) the registrants of <legostorebr.online>, <legostorebr.store> and <legostrangerthings.site> share the same phone and fax numbers; and (ix) the disputed domain names share similar compositions.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 3.1](#), 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.

Where the complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other third-party marks (i.e., <mark1+mark2.tld>), is insufficient in itself to avoid a finding of confusing similarity to the complainant's mark under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.12.

The Panel finds the Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, variously, "story", "store", "br" and "strangerthings" 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 that 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 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.

The websites to which the disputed domain names <legostorybr.site> and <strangerthingslego.shop> previously resolved did not appear to fall under the safeguards of fair use envisioned under section 2.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), given there is no prominent disclaimer on the website as to the lack of association with the Complainant. To the contrary, the Panel accepts the Complainant’s evidence that (i) the disputed domain name <legostorybr.site> displayed prominently the Mark in the form of the Complainant’s logo; and (ii) the disputed domain name <strangerthingslego.shop> displayed a statement in Portuguese translating as “Shop Comercial LTDA is the official partner for the licensed LEGO site in Brazil”.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 (i) the Complainant’s Mark is well-known; (ii) the Respondent registered, within a period of four days, the five disputed domain names, which are confusingly similar to the Mark for the reasons given above; (iii) the disputed domain name <legostorybr.site> previously displayed prominently the Mark in the form of the Complainant’s logo; and (iv) the disputed domain name <strangerthingslego.shop> displayed a false statement that it was “the official partner for the licensed LEGO Group website in Brazil”.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that evidence of a respondent seeking to cause confusion supports a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. The Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the Respondent’s failure to participate in the proceedings, and the

composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names (at various times) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the content of the websites previously hosted at two of the disputed domain names is strongly suggestive of bad faith because it is evidence of the Respondent seeking to cause confusion. In light of the Panel's conclusion that all the disputed domain names are under common control and appear to have targeted the Complainant, the Panel takes the content of these websites into account for the purposes of its determinations in relation to all the disputed domain names.

Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Furthermore, the Respondent has not attempted to refute any of the Complainant's contentions, which casts additional doubt on the nature of its conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel concludes that the actions of the Respondent in choosing the disputed domain names were aimed at attracting, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names <legostorebr.online>, <legostorebr.store>, <legostorybr.site>, <legostrangerthings.site>, and <strangerthingslego.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David Stone/

David Stone

Sole Panelist

Date: March 27, 2026