

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. leggo Mx, Lego Mx
Case No. D2026-1213

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is leggo Mx, Lego Mx, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legomx.store> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) 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 20, 2026. On March 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On March 20, 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 0177630693) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 24, 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 26, 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 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Weston as the sole panelist in this matter on May 11, 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 operates a business selling toys in more than 130 countries. The Complainant holds registrations for the LEGO trademark and variations of it, such as LEGOLAND, in numerous jurisdictions including International Registration no. 869258 (figurative) for the mark LEGO, registered on November 11, 2005, and United States of America trademark registration no. 75504012, for the mark LEGOLAND, registered on March 28, 2000 in classes 35, 41 and 42.

The Complainant conducts business on the Internet using numerous domain names containing the word “lego”, including <lego.com>, with a toy business website resolving from these domain names. The Complainant also owns more than 5,000 domain names comprising or containing the word “lego”.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 1, 2026 and resolves to an online store that allegedly sells products that resemble or compete with the Complainant’s products; some of the products bear the Complainant’s trademark.

6. 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 cites its trademark registrations for the mark LEGO, as prima facie evidence of ownership.

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark, because the Disputed Domain Name is comprised of the LEGO trademark and that the addition of the letters “mx” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.store” is not sufficient to prevent the finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant submits: “On the contrary, particularly considering the [Disputed] Domain Name is hosted in Spanish, the conjunction of the letters [“mx”] with the Complainant’s LEGO trademark is likely to heighten confusion as users would reasonably believe the [Disputed] Domain Name is affiliated with the Mexican arm of the Complainant’s business.”

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because “[n]o license or authorization of any other kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent, to use the trademark LEGO”, and infers that none of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy apply. The Complainant also submits that “the Respondent is not an authorized reseller” and would be unable to avail itself of the safe harbor to be found in the case of *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) that is in some circumstances available to bona fide resellers of genuine branded goods.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was, and currently is, in bad faith, contrary to the Policy and the Rules having regard to evidence that points to awareness of the Complainant and its trademark. On the issue of registration in bad faith the Complainant submits that “[i]t is obvious that it is the fame of the trademark that has motivated the Respondent to register the [Disputed] Domain Name”. On the issue of bad faith use, the Complainant submits “the [Disputed] Domain Name is currently connected to an unauthorized commercial website offering LEGO products. The Complainant’s logo is prominently displayed on the website”, and that this amounts to use in bad faith. The Complainant also submits that “following the disclosure of the Respondent information the registrant is listed

as 'LeggoMx' / 'Lego Mx'. The Complainant submits the Respondent has intentionally provided false details for the purpose of avoiding detection and a means of appearing legitimate. Such falsified information is another indication of Respondent's bad faith."

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

- (i) that the Disputed Domain Name 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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. The requirements of the first element of the Policy may be satisfied by a trademark registered in any jurisdiction. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.2. The Complainant has produced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has registered trademark rights in the mark LEGO.

Turning to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the LEGO trademark, the Panel observes that the Disputed Domain Name is comprised of: (a) an exact reproduction of the Complainant's trademark LEGO; (b) followed by the letters "mx"; (c) followed by the gTLD ".store".

It is well established that the gTLD used as part of a domain name is generally disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11. The relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name, specifically: "legomx".

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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 Disputed 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 Panel notes that the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademark and that there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, let alone any accurate or prominent disclosure of that relationship, or absence of such, on its website. The use of the Complainant's trademark, the use of the red and yellow color scheme, and similarity of the parties respective products (many of which actually bear the Complainant's trademark) displayed on the Respondent's website suggests that the Respondent has deliberately targeted the Complainant. The Panel finds that the Respondent's activities do not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, given the substantial reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's mark and lack of any disclosure of the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

Panels often apply the test set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) ("the Oki Data test") when a respondent is using a disputed domain name to sell goods subject to a complainant's trademark rights. The test helps panels determine whether that respondent has legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and sets out four requirements:

- The respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue.
- The respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods;
- The site must accurately and prominently disclose the respondent's relationship with the trademark owner;
- The Respondent must not try to corner the market in all domain names that reflect the trademark.

The Panels finds that the Respondent's website does not meet the Oki Data requirements as the Respondent is not an authorized reseller and the website does not disclose the nature of its relationship with the Complainant as the owner of the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

On the issue of registration, taking into account the composition of the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's famous trademark, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant's trademark LEGO when it registered the Disputed Domain Name. This Panel finds that there is no reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Name other than to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, a gap of several years between registration of a complainant's trademark and respondent's registration of a disputed domain name (containing the trademark) may indicate bad faith registration. In this case, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name dozens of years after the Complainant established registered trademark rights in the LEGO mark. The Respondent has not come forward to rebut the Complainant's allegations or to offer an alternative explanation.

On the issue of use, the Complainant's evidence is that the Disputed Domain Name was used to host a website that displays content superficially similar to that of the Complainant's legitimate website, displaying the Complainant's trademark and color scheme, and making reference to products similar to or the same as those displayed by the Complainant on its own webpage. There is also displayed a field to harvest email addresses.

The Panel accepts that the website content in conjunction with the letters "mx" coupled with the Complainant's trademark in the Disputed Domain Name itself would be likely to reinforce the misleading nature of the Disputed Domain Name. In the circumstances, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

There is also evidence that the Respondent provided false contact details to shield its identity when registering the Disputed Domain Name. Previous panel decisions have found that providing false information for the Whois database to shield a registrant's identity can support an inference of bad faith. In this case, the registrant organization identified in the registration details of the disputed domain name is "Lego Mx", which to the Panel reinforces the finding that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1

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 <legomx.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Weston/

Nicholas Weston

Sole Panelist

Date: May 15, 2026