ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. mohammad hossein askari, payshkaran
Case No. D2026-1089

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is mohammad hossein askari, payshkaran, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <shahrlego.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 13, 2026. On March 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 15, 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 (Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 16, 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 18, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on April 23, 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, and all other trademarks used in connection with the famous LEGO brands of construction toys and other LEGO branded products. Among others, the Complainant owns International Trademark registration No. 287932 for LEGO, registered on August 27, 1964, in Class 28. The Complainant's licensees are authorized to exploit the Complainant's intellectual property rights, including its trademark rights, in Malaysia and elsewhere. Over the years, the business of making and selling LEGO branded toys has grown remarkably. Founded in 1932, the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including: five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites, and over 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs more than 28,500 individuals and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries.

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

The Complainant also maintains extensive websites under the domain names <lego.com> and <legoland.com>. According to Similarweb.com, the website at the Complainant's <lego.com> primary domain name has a popularity rank of 1,136th globally and 675th in the United States of America. In January 2025 alone the website received a total of 38 million visits.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 24, 2023. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive page but previously resolved to a website selling the Complainant's products as well as of its competitors.

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 dominant part of the disputed domain name comprises the term "lego", identical to the Complainant's domain names and to the registered trademark LEGO, registered by the Complainant as trademarks in numerous jurisdictions all over the world including in France, where the Respondent is based.

In addition to the trademark LEGO, the disputed domain name also comprises the prefix "shahr". The Complainant asserts it is a long-established precedent that confusing similarity is generally recognized when well-known trademarks are paired up with different kinds of generic prefixes and suffixes. The same conclusion applies regarding the above-mentioned prefix, as it does not detract from the overall impression.

The Complainant has not found that the Respondent has any registered trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain name. Neither has the Complainant found anything that would suggest that the Respondent has been using LEGO in any other way that would provide any legitimate rights in the disputed domain name. Consequently, the Respondent may not claim any rights established by common usage.

There is no evidence, including the Whois record for the disputed domain name, that would suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, then Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

No license or authorization of any other kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent, to use the trademark.

It is highly unlikely that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant's legal rights in the name LEGO at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. In fact, it is rather obvious that it is the fame of the trademark that has motivated the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. That is, the Respondent cannot claim to have been using LEGO, without being aware of the Complainant's rights to it.

The Respondent was using the disputed domain name to offer the Complainant's toy products for sale. The Respondent has failed to sell only the Complainant's toy products, but it was also offering products of other toy brands. The Respondent did not accurately or prominently disclose their relationship with the Complainant on the disputed domain name's website.

The Respondent was using 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. The Respondent's past use of the disputed domain name constituted a disruption of the Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the famous LEGO mark. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's LEGO trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term "shahr" does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable in the disputed domain name and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element test.. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.8, and *Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org / Conan Corrigan*, WIPO Case No. D2015-2316.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g.*, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.,* WIPO Case No. D2003-0455.

Here, the Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to an active website seemingly offering the Complainant's products but also offering competing third party products. While resellers and distributors may be found to have rights to use a complainant's trademark for nominative purposes, the lack of any information on the disputed domain name as to the website's lack of authorization or relation to the Complainant, and the offering of competing products prevents a finding of rights or legitimate interests on behalf of the Respondent . See section 2.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, reproducing the Complainant's well-known trademark added by the term "shahr", the Persian word for "land", creates a risk of implied affiliation. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered decades after the Complainant first used its trademarks. The evidence provided by the Complainant makes it clear that the Respondent undoubtedly knew of the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

Further, the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users, for commercial gain. The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name was used previously to sell both the Complainant's products as well as the products of Complainant's competitors is evidence of bad faith use. The current non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent such finding of bad faith.

The Panel thus finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith and 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 name <shahrlego.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/
Colin T. O'Brien
Sole Panelist
Date: May 8, 2026