

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LEGO Holding A/S v. Jenna Agnone, LegoFlora  
Case No. D2026-0905

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Jenna Agnone, LegoFlora, United States of America (“United States”).

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

The disputed domain name <legoflora.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 2, 2026. On March 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 3, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0176477887) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 4, 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 March 4, 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 March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 26, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on March 27, 2026, stating that it did not own or control the disputed domain name.

The Center appointed Anne-Virginie La Spada as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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, based in Denmark, is the owner of the LEGO trademark used in connection with the construction bricks and toys and other LEGO branded products. Founded in 1932, the Complainant's group comprises subsidiaries and branches throughout the world and employs more than 28,500 individuals. The LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in the United States.

The LEGO trademark is regularly listed in various rankings as being among the best-known trademarks in the world.

Among many other registrations throughout the world, the Complainant owns the United States trademark registration no. 4395578 for LEGO (word mark), registered on September 3, 2013, in classes 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 28.

The Complainant operates the official website at "www.lego.com".

One of its collection of products called "Botanicals" features flowers and floral arrangements.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 22, 2025.

Before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name was used in connection with a website selling products which directly compete with Complainant's own offerings. Specifically, the Respondent was offering brick sets for flowers.

The Complainant sent a notification of violation of trademark rights to the Respondent (at the address of the privacy service employed by the Respondent) on November 10 and 17, 2025. The Respondent replied on November 17, 2025, that it had stopped using the disputed domain name and was in the process of "removing it permanently". At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not lead to an active web page.

#### **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 LEGO, despite the presence of the suffix "flora" which does not diminish the confusing similarity.

The Complainant furthermore contends that it has not found any indication that would suggest that the Respondent has any legitimate rights in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, and the Complainant did not grant any license or authorization of any kind to the Respondent to use the mark LEGO in the disputed domain name. The Complainant also sets forth that the Respondent did not make any bona fide offering of goods or services under the disputed domain name but used it to sell products competing with the Complainant's products.

In view of the substantial and widespread goodwill attached to its trademark LEGO, the Complainant is convinced that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights when it registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users to its own website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website, thus using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent replied to the Center's notification of default email stating that "I received the notice regarding Case D2026-0905. I do not own or control the domain legoflora.com."

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must assert and prove each of the following:

- (i) the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the 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 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, flora) 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.

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.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website selling competing goods. Given the notoriety of the Complainant's LEGO trademark, the Respondent could not ignore that the presence of such LEGO trademark in the disputed domain name was likely to divert consumers looking for the Complainant's products. Use of a domain name that aims at taking advantage of the goodwill attached to a competitor's mark does not constitute a bona fide or legitimate use. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2. The Respondent's use of "LegoFlora" as its organization name when registering the disputed domain name does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of this case.

Finally, the Panel observes that upon receipt of the Complainant's cease and desist notification, the Respondent did not assert any rights or legitimate interests but announced that it had stopped using the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not file a formal response to the Complaint but sent to the Center an email communication stating that it did not own or control the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent's attitude corroborates the Complainant's prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or 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.

Given the well-known character of the LEGO trademark, the Panel accepts that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. It is indeed implausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name without having the Complainant's trademark in mind. The Panel holds therefore that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to sell products of a different brand that were in direct competition with the Complainant's products. The Panel finds that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to its own website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. This amounts to use 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 name <legoflora.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Anne-Virginie La Spada/*

**Anne-Virginie La Spada**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2026