

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. SHENG MU, HONGKONG MUSHENG BUSINESS CONSULT LIMITED

Case No. D2026-1733

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is SHENG MU, HONGKONG MUSHENG BUSINESS CONSULT LIMITED, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legoshoptop.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 23, 2026. On April 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 24, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT) / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 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 April 27, 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 April 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Martin Švorčík as the sole panelist in this matter on June 9, 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 was founded in 1932 and is one of the world's leading manufacturers of construction toys and related products. Its products are marketed in more than 130 countries through subsidiaries, licensees, retail stores, and online platforms.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the trademark LEGO throughout the world. These include, inter alia:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 002829463 for LEGO, registered on January 7, 2004; and
- International Registration No. 869258 for the LEGO logo, registered on November 11, 2005.

The Complainant also owns numerous additional national and international trademark registrations for LEGO and the LEGO logo in many jurisdictions worldwide.

The Complainant also owns and operates a substantial portfolio of domain names incorporating the LEGO trademark, including its principal website at <lego.com>, through which it markets and sells its products and provides information regarding its business.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 4, 2026. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's LEGO logo and offering LEGO products for sale at heavily discounted prices. Following the Complainant's takedown notice, the website became inactive.

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.

In particular, the Complainant submits that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LEGO trademark, which is incorporated in its entirety, while the additional terms "shop" and "top" are merely descriptive and do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the LEGO trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and is not making a bona fide or legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent registered a domain name incorporating the Complainant's LEGO trademark and used it to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the associated website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) 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. 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, "shop" and "top" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

The Panel has also considered the illustrative circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The available evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's LEGO logo and offering LEGO products without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant. In the circumstances of this case, such use does not establish 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 worldwide reputation of the LEGO trademark, the Panel considers it inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights. The combination of the famous LEGO trademark with the terms "shop" and "top" appears deliberately designed to suggest an official sales channel operated by or affiliated with the Complainant.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's LEGO logo and offering purported LEGO products without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that after take down notice by the Complainant, the content was taken down and the domain name is now inactive.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name and its prior use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent's failure to submit any Response further reinforces the inference of bad faith registration and use.

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 <legoshoptop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Martin Švorčík/

Martin Švorčík

Sole Panelist

Date: June 23, 2026