

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Przemyslaw Wasiluk
Case No. D2026-0518

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Przemyslaw Wasiluk, Poland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <przeceny-lego.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 6, 2026. On February 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 9, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 10, 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 February 11, 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 February 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Zineb Naciri Bennani as the sole panelist in this matter on March 12, 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 company incorporated in Denmark, founded in 1932. The Complainant is engaged in the manufacture, marketing, and sale of construction toys and other products.

The Complainant operates on a global scale, with numerous subsidiaries and branches worldwide, including five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites, and more than 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs over 28,500 individuals, and its products are sold in more than 130 countries.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark rights including the following:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00900039800 for LEGO, registered on October 5, 1998, in relation with goods in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 20, 24, 25, 28, 38, 41, 42; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 39834 for LEGO, registered on November 09, 1998, in relation with goods in classes 3, 9, 16, 20, 24, 25, 28, 42.

The Complainant claims ownership of more than 6,000 domain names incorporating the trademark, including <lego.com> registered on August 22, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 29, 2025, and directed previously to a website proposing products under the Complainant's trademark. Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive 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 contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known trademark.

According to the Complainant the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark in its entirety as its dominant element and the addition of the prefix "przeceny", a hyphen, and the ".com" gTLD does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as such elements are generic or non-distinctive.

The Complainant asserts that the risk of confusion is further reinforced by the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name to host a website offering Complainant's products.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name knowing that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized or licensed to use the trademark, and is not an authorized reseller.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent previously used the disputed domain name for an unauthorized commercial website offering Complainant's products at discounted prices, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, without disclosing the lack of relationship with the Complainant and falsely suggested an official or authorized connection.

The Complainant argues that given the global fame of the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent intentionally registered the domain name to exploit the goodwill associated with the trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel should decide a complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy and the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must establish each of the following:

(i) that the disputed domain name registered to the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

The disputed domain name incorporates the trademark in its entirety. It is well established that where a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's registered trademark, this is sufficient to establish confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of other terms here, "przeceny" and a hyphen, 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, the generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”) (e.g., “.com”, “.net”, “.org”) is typically disregarded for the purpose of the comparison under the Policy.

Given the fame and distinctiveness of the trademark, Internet users are likely to assume that the disputed domain name is owned by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to 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 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 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 disputed domain name previously resolved to a website offering products under the Complainant’s trademark. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, as it falsely suggests an affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant. Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s well-known trademark in its entirety (and as it appears a Polish word “przeceny”, which seems to translate as “discounts” in English), carries a risk of implied affiliation.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website. Panels have consistently found that the passive holding of a domain name does not confer rights or legitimate interests, particularly where the domain name incorporates a well-known trademark and there is no plausible explanation for its registration and use by the respondent.

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 has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In particular, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known trademark in its entirety. Given the global reputation of the Complainant, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name was used to resolve to a website offering products under the Complainant's trademark. Such use demonstrates an intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is associated with or endorsed by the Complainant, thereby generating commercial gain from the confusion created.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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. 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 <przeceny-lego.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zineb Naciri Bennani/

Zineb Naciri Bennani

Sole Panelist

Date: March 23, 2026