

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. joselynr joselynr

Case No. D2026-1734

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is joselynr joselynr, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bricklego.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (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 27, 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 (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 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 30, 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 May 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Indrek Eelmets as the sole panelist in this matter on June 1, 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 a Danish company mainly active in the business of making and selling construction toys. The Complainant is the owner of the LEGO trademark used in connection with the well-known LEGO brand of construction toys and other LEGO branded products. The Complaint states that the Complainant's products are sold in more than 130 countries, including the United States and the European Union.

The Complainant owns many trademark registrations globally. The Complainant is in particular the owner of the following trademark registrations:

Jurisdictions	Trademark	Registration Number	Registration Date
European Union	LEGO	000039800	October 5, 1998
United States	LEGO	1248936	August 23, 1983

The Complainant operates on the Internet at the main website "www.lego.com", as well as with many other generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs") including the trademark LEGO.

The disputed domain name <bricklego.com> was registered on February 12, 2026. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name was previously used for a website that claimed an affiliation with the Complainant, displayed the Complainant's logo, and offered LEGO products for sale. Following a takedown notice sent by the Complainant's representative, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website lacking substantive content.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since the disputed domain name contains the LEGO mark in its entirety, with the only difference being the insertion of the descriptive term "brick" before the Complainant's mark. The Complainant submits that the term "brick" does not diminish confusing similarity, but rather increases confusion because it is directly related to the goods offered under the Complainant's LEGO trademark.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since the Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the LEGO trademark or to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent has any registered trademark or trade name corresponding to the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not an authorized reseller and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant states that the Respondent previously used the disputed domain name for a website that displayed the Complainant's logo and had a similar layout to the Complainant's website, while offering LEGO products for sale, and that the website did not adequately disclose the lack of relationship between the

Respondent and the Complainant. The Complainant also states that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website, which does not demonstrate rights or legitimate interests.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since the Complainant's LEGO trademark is well-known and substantially predates registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent previously used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LEGO trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The Complainant also relies on the subsequent passive holding of the disputed domain name, following the takedown notice, as further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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, brick, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name, as the trademark had been registered and had become well known internationally long before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that the Respondent used the disputed domain name for a website purportedly offering LEGO products and prominently displaying the Complainant's logo, which further supports a finding that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

The Panel further notes that, following the Complainant's takedown notice, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to the website previously used by the Respondent and is currently inactive. However, such inactivity does not preclude a finding of bad faith.

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 and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name and the Respondent's failure to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <bricklego.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Indrek Eelmets/

Indrek Eelmets

Sole Panelist

Date: June 15, 2026