

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. John Mullee
Case No. D2026-0945

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is John Mullee, Ireland.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <flowersbylego.com> and <legoflorists.com> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 5, 2026. On March 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On March 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names that differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 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 March 12, 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 amended Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for a response was April 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 8, 2026. The Center received an email communication from the Respondent on April 24, 2026.

The Center appointed A. Justin Ourso III as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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 LEGO Holding A/S, formerly LEGO Juris A/S, has been selling construction toys under its globally well-known LEGO trademark for over ninety years, since 1932.

The Complainant owns a European Union registration, No. 000039800, for its LEGO trademark, entered in the register on October 5, 1998, in Class 28 for “games and playthings”, among other goods, and in Class 41 for “[e]ducation, providing of training; entertainment”, and for other goods and services in other classes.

The Complainant owns the domain name <lego.com>, which it registered on August 22, 1995, and operates its primary website at “www.lego.com” on which it advertises and offers its construction toys and other products under its LEGO mark, including its “Botanical Collection”, which includes building block sets to construct flowers, floral bouquets and arrangements, flowering plants, and flowering branches.

The Respondent, using a domain name privacy service, registered both Domain Names on September 24, 2025, without any authorization from the Complainant. The Complainant wrote three demand letters to the Respondent urging that the Respondent transfer one of the Domain Names to it for the Respondent’s registration and transfer expenses, to which the Respondent failed to reply. Prior to the filing of the Complaint, each Domain Name resolved to a parked web page that contained pay-per-click (“PPC”) links related to the flower business and offered the Domain Name for sale. After the filing of the Complaint, during the preparation of this decision, the Domain Names did not resolve to a functioning web site when the Panel used the Edge browser. When using the Firefox browser, the Domain Name <flowersbylego.com> redirected to a third-party landing page at “www.dot-shopping.org” and the Domain Name <legoflorists.com> redirected to a third-party landing page at “www.searchhounds.com”, each landing page containing PPC links competitive with Complainant products and offering to sell the Domain Name. These third-party sites are ad revenue and content directory platforms that registrars use to generate revenue from parked domain names.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy to transfer the Domain Names, which it requested.

Notably, the Complainant contends that because of the fame of its LEGO mark, the Respondent could not claim to be unaware of its existence; the only rational reason for choosing the Domain Names was to attract the Complainant’s customers to the Respondent’s site for commercial gain, regardless of whether the gain was to the Respondent, because the Respondent had contractual control of the site’s content; the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant to attract Internet users seeking the Complainant’s goods and services to the Respondent’s parked web pages featuring competitive PPC links in bad faith; and that the Respondent not only used a privacy service but also provided incomplete contact information to the Registrar.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal response to the amended Complaint.

On April 24, 2026, the Respondent sent the following to the Center: “I registered both these Domain names as I had a business idea and in good faith. I have a business plan almost completed which I had always intended to collaborate with official current Lego seller. Also to seek any aproval.required. I apologise for late response as I.on.came home from hospital Monday. I do object to the term ‘bad faith’ as I have and had no nefarious intentions (...).”

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must prove three elements to obtain relief: (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and (iii) the respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

On the first element, a complainant must prove that (1) it has rights in a trademark and (2) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to this trademark. Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

The Panel finds that the Complainant’s trademark registrations establish the Complainant’s trademark rights. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, 3.1 (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#),”) section 1.2.1.

Each Domain Name incorporates the entire trademark, and the trademark is readily recognizable within each Domain Name, notwithstanding the addition of the elements “flowersby” before the trademark in <flowersbylego.com> and “florists” after the trademark in <legoflorists.com>. The Panel finds that each Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the first element: the Domain Names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has not claimed the existence of any circumstance under the Policy, paragraph 4(c), that demonstrates that a respondent has rights to, or legitimate interests in, a domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that it established its trademark rights before the Respondent registered the Domain Names; the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark; the record contains no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by either Domain Name, indeed, the Registrar identified the Respondent with a Registrant Name that does not resemble either Domain Name; the record contains no evidence that the Respondent owns a trademark registration for either Domain Name or operates a legitimate business under either Domain Name; and the Respondent has used the Domain Names to trade on the goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark, by attracting Internet users to web pages with PPC links that compete with the Complainant’s business, which is not a bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, and 2.9. This record constitutes prima facie a showing that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii), shifting the burden of production on this second element to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence proving rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1. The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to rebut the prima facie showing.

Of particular interest in this proceeding is that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant’s mark by registering two domain names on the same day, each of which contains elements in addition to the trademark that are descriptive of products and services featured and offered by the Complainant on its website, namely, its “Botanical Collection”, which includes building block sets to construct flowers, floral bouquets and arrangements, flowering plants, and flowering branches. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven, and the evidence demonstrates, the second element: the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy provides that the following circumstance is “evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: [. . .] by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site . . . , by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site”. Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The Panel finds that the composition of the Domain Names, namely, the incorporation of a globally well-known and distinctive mark, is a deliberate attempt to suggest an authorized association with the Complainant and demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark before the Respondent registered the Domain Names. Also, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of activity-targeting the Complainant’s mark by registering two confusingly similar domain names on the same day.

Of particular interest in this proceeding is that, among the Complainant’s construction toys are building blocks specially made for its “Botanical Collection”, discussed above in Part 6(B), which the Complainant features and sells on its website. The record also contains evidence that the Complainant has offered on its site workshops on its Botanicals Collection and on using its botanical related building blocks. The Panel finds that the Domain Names resolve to landing pages with PPC links to products and services in the floral industry, which the Panel finds conclusive evidence that the Respondent is using the Domain Names to attract, misleadingly and deceptively, Internet users and potential customers of the Complainant to the Respondent’s websites for the Respondent’s commercial gain. Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv); [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4, 3.2.1, and 3.2.2.

The Complainant has alleged that the Respondent failed to respond to its demand letters, and the record contains demand letters regarding one of the Domain Names, <flowersbylego.com>, but no reply to them from the Respondent. Additionally, the Panel finds that the Respondent not only used a privacy service but also gave the Registrar an incomplete contact address and failed to respond to the Complaint, all of which support a conclusion of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.6.

The findings above compel the Panel to conclude that the Respondent intentionally registered the Domain Names in bad faith to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark and that the Respondent is using the Domain Names in bad faith intentionally to attract Internet users to its sites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source of the goods and services offered through the Domain Names, in violation of the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv). The Panel notes the Respondent’s email communication sent on April 24, 2026. The argument of the Respondent does not change the Panel’s findings or conclusions. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven, and the evidence demonstrates, the third element: the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

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 Domain Names <flowersbylego.com> and <legoflorists.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/A. Justin Ourso III/

A. Justin Ourso III

Sole Panelist

Date: April 27, 2026