

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LEGO Holding A/S v. Lucca Oliveira, Alexsandro Mendes  
Case No. D2026-1002

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondents are Lucca Oliveira, Brazil and Alexsandro Mendes, Brazil.

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

The disputed domain names <legostores.online>, <legostores.site>, <lojalego.online>, and <lojalego.store> 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 March 9, 2026. On March 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 12, 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 March 17, 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 March 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 7, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Maninder Singh as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 the owner of the LEGO trademark, and all other trademarks used in connection with the famous LEGO brands of construction toys and other LEGO branded products.

The Complainant's headquarter is in Billund, Denmark. The Complainant was founded in 1932 and has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites and more than 500 sales stores. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in Brazil and the European Union.

The LEGO trademark is among the best-known trademarks in the world, due to decades of extensive advertising, which prominently depicts the LEGO mark on all products, packaging, displays and promotional materials. The LEGO trademark and brand have been recognized as being famous.

The Complainant has expanded its use of the LEGO trademark to computer hardware and software, books, videos and computer controlled robotic construction sets. The Complainant also maintains extensive websites under the domain names [www.lego.com](http://www.lego.com) and [www.legoland.com](http://www.legoland.com).

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for LEGO and LEGOLAND, including the following:

- Brazil trademark registration No. 730130533 for LEGO (word mark), filed on July 12, 1973 and registered on January 16, 1982, in class 28;
- Brazil trademark registration No. 006187960 for LEGOLAND (word mark), filed on October 07, 1971 and registered on December 25, 1975, in class 28
- Brazil trademark registration No. 825261023 for LEGO (figurative mark), filed on January 31, 2003 and registered on May 8, 2007, in class 28.
- Brazil trademark registration No. 831076810 for LEGOLAND (word mark), filed on June 17, 2011 and registered on October 21, 2014, in class 41;

The Complainant registered the domain name [<lego.com>](http://lego.com) on August 22, 1995 and [<legoland.com>](http://legoland.com) on August 4, 1998.

The Complainant is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark.

The Respondents have registered the disputed domain names i.e. [<lojalego.online>](http://lojalego.online) and [<lojalego.store>](http://lojalego.store) on January 5, 2026 and [<legostores.site>](http://legostores.site) and [<legostores.online>](http://legostores.online) on January 6, 2026 and prior to a takedown notice sent by the Complainant's representatives, the disputed domain names were used to host websites that utilized the Complainant's LEGO logo while claiming to offer for sale the Complainant's products.

## **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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark LEGO in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain names reproduce the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the generic term "stores" and "loja" (Portuguese term for "store") and the generic Top-Level domain ("gTLD") ".online" and ".site", which do not diminish the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant states that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names as: i) the Respondents do not have any registered trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain names; (ii) the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names; (iii) no license or authorization of any other kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondents, to use the trademark LEGO; (iv) the Respondents have not been using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, since prior to a takedown notice sent by the Complainant's representatives, the disputed domain names, specifically, the disputed domain names <legostores.site>, <lojalego.online> and <lojalego.store> were used to resolve to websites that impersonated the Complainant through the use of the Complainant's LEGO logo, while claiming to offer for the Complainant's products for sale and <legostores.online> was used to redirect Internet users to a website that resolves to a blank page and did not have any content.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant states that the Respondents have registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith because: i) the Complainant's trademark is a reputed trademark and has substantial goodwill across the globe; ii) the Complainant's rights in the LEGO mark long predate the registration of the disputed domain names, which have been registered very recently in January 2026; (iii) the disputed domain names use the Complainant's logo. The Complainant concludes that the Respondents are using the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to a 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.

The Complainant further points out that the Respondents, at the time of filing of the Complaint, had employed a privacy service to hide their identities, which past Panels have held serves as further evidence of bad faith registration and use.

### **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. General**

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain names, the Complainant is required to prove that:

(i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and

(iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

## **B. Procedural Issue - Consolidation of Proceedings**

In response to the communication from the Center regarding the identity of the Respondents having been made available to the Complainant, the amended Complaint was filed in relation to different domain name registrants.

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. The Respondents have registered the disputed domain names i.e. <lojalego.online> and <lojalego.store> on January 5, 2026 and <legostores.site> and <legostores.online> on January 6, 2026.

Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules states that “A Panel shall decide a request by a Party to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and these Rules”.

Section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)) summarizes the consensus view of UDRP panels on the consolidation of multiple respondents and provides that where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels consider whether the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and whether the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names are 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 record indicates the disputed domain names are under common control. All four disputed domain names were registered a day apart. Three of the disputed domain names <legostores.site>, <lojalego.online> and <lojalego.store> previously hosted identical content as exhibited via submitted Annexures to the Complaint. The Panel agrees with Complainant’s contention that the connection between the disputed domain names is reinforced by the similarity in composition. They all utilise new gTLDs (“.site”, “.online”, “.store”) and use the terms “loja” and “store” in the second level interchangeably, terms which share the same meaning.

The Panel also finds merit in the Complainant’s contention that it is implausible of a situation where separate registrants, having no connection with other would register domain names targeting the same trademark, with three out of four sharing the same exact website content, same infringing use and similar composition in the second level, are not commonly held.

The Panel has gone through the relevant annexures of the Complaint as stated above and takes note of the fact that each of the three web pages had the same LEGO logo, images and similar content, exactly at the same place. In the facts of the present case, the Panel finds that the consolidation would also be fair and equitable to all parties. The Respondents have not presented any arguments against the request of the complainant for consolidation. The Panel finds it appropriate and proper to grant the request for consolidation made by the Complainant and will refer to the Respondents in the singular, i.e., the “Respondent”.

## **C. 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. The addition of generic terms “store” and “loja” (Portuguese term for ‘store’) and the gTLD “.online” and “.site”, do not diminish the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds the mark LEGO is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical and confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

#### **D. 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.

The Panel observes that the Respondent is in no way related to the Complainant or its business activities. The Respondent is neither an agent nor a dealer of the Complainant, nor does he carry out activities for the Complainant. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names. The mark LEGO indisputably vests in the Complainant as evidenced by various statutory registrations, secured by the Complainant across the globe.

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 Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

#### **E. 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.

The Panel observes that there is virtually no possibility that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s trademark, its existence or presence in the market. In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names to deceive Internet users into believing that the disputed domain names are operated or authorized by the Complainant, and to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the mark LEGO for commercial gain.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 <legostores.online>, <legostores.site>, <lojalego.online>, and <lojalego.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Maninder Singh/*

**Maninder Singh**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 23, 2026