

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. huapusjmn huapusjmn
Case No. D2026-1890

1. The Parties

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

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

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legolandnewyorkresortdirect.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 1, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 4, 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 Purposes / Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 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 May 5, 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 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Manuel Wegrosteck as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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 LEGO Holding A/S, a globally recognized leader for construction toys, headquartered in Denmark. Founded in 1932, the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including five main hubs, 37 sales offices, six manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores distributing LEGO construction toys and other LEGO branded products.

Further, the LEGOLAND theme parks are operated under exclusive license rights in the LEGOLAND trademark owned by the LEGO group. In 2023, the LEGOLAND theme parks received 16.7 million visitors while generating GDP 914 million in revenue. The Complainant operates the LEGOLAND New York Resort in Goshen, New York.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for LEGO ("LEGO Trademark"), including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 2245652, registered on May 18, 1999;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000039800, registered on October 5, 1998; and
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00900039800, registered on October 5, 1998.

The Complainant is further the owner of numerous trademark registrations for LEGOLAND ("LEGOLAND Trademark"), including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 2334535, registered on March 28, 2000;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000054205, registered on October 5, 1998; and
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00900054205, registered on October 5, 1998.

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names including the LEGO Trademark or the LEGOLAND Trademark, such as <lego.com>, registered on August 22, 1995, and <legoland.com>, registered on August 4, 1998.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 12, 2026. At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website. The Complainant provided evidence that the disputed domain name previously resolved to an active website prominently displaying the LEGO Trademark, the LEGOLAND Trademark as well as the red-and-white LEGO logo, claiming to offer Complainant's construction toy 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 name.

On the first element of the Policy, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LEGOLAND Trademark. In creating the disputed domain name, the Respondent has added the phrase “New York Resort Direct” to the LEGOLAND Trademark. The fact that such phrase is closely linked and associated with the LEGOLAND Trademark only serves to underscore and increase the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the LEGOLAND Trademark, since the Complainant operates the LEGOLAND New York Resort in Goshen, New York.

On the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not found that the Respondent has any registered trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant has not found anything that would suggest that the Respondent has been using “LEGO” or “LEGOLAND” in any other way that would provide legitimate rights in any of the names. It is also clear that no license or authorization of any other kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent, to use the LEGO Trademark or the LEGOLAND Trademark. It is highly unlikely that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant’s legal rights in the LEGO Trademark or the LEGOLAND Trademark. In fact, it is rather obvious that it is the fame of the trademarks that has motivated the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. In the instant case, the pertinent Notice of Registrant information identifies the Registrant as “Huapusjmn Huapusjmn”, which does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. Thus, where no evidence, including the Whois record for the disputed domain name, suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

On the third element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The LEGO Trademark in respect of toys belonging to the Complainant has the status of a well-known and reputable trademark with substantial and widespread goodwill throughout the world. The awareness of the LEGO Trademark is considered, in the Community in general, to be significant and substantial. The number of third-party domain name registrations comprising the LEGO trademark in combination with other words has always been attractive to domain name infringers. It is obvious that it is the fame of the LEGO Trademark that has motivated the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. The Respondent cannot claim to have been using the LEGO Trademark or the LEGOLAND Trademark, without being aware of the Complainant’s rights to it. The disputed domain name was previously connected to an unauthorized commercial website offering LEGO products. The Complainant’s logo was prominently displayed on the website. Consequently, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name 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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires that the Panel’s decision be made “on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

The Complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the Complaint with respect to each disputed domain name, namely that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 disputed domain name contains the LEGOLAND Trademark in its entirety, with the only difference being the addition of a geographical term and generic terms creating the phrase "newyorkresortdirect". The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise), in this case "newyorkresortdirect", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals, phishing/identity theft, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the LEGO Trademark or the LEGOLAND Trademark. The Panel finds that there are no indications that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or otherwise has any rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name is not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the disputed domain name previously resolved to an active website prominently displaying the LEGO Trademark, the LEGOLAND Trademark, as well as the red-and-white LEGO logo, claiming to offer Complainant's construction toy products.

The website linked to the disputed domain name did not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant, thus creating the false impression that the Respondent might be authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant.

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.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Panels also have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (as applicable here: impersonation/passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Moreover, 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 disputed domain name incorporates the LEGOLAND Trademark in its entirety, with the only difference being the addition of the phrase "newyorkresortdirect", which consists of a geographical term as well as generic terms. Considering the distinctiveness and public presence of the LEGO Trademark and the LEGOLAND Trademark, Internet users may think the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant and would resolve to a website related to the Complainant. In particular, Internet users could regard the phrase "newyorkresortdirect" included in the disputed domain name as a reference to the LEGOLAND New York Resort in Goshen, New York. Further, the disputed domain name previously resolved to an active website prominently displaying the LEGO Trademark, the LEGOLAND Trademark as well as the red-and-white LEGO logo, claiming to offer Complainant's construction toy products. Moreover, the website linked to the disputed domain name did not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant. As shown above, the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the evidence leads to the conclusion that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the LEGO Trademark as well as the LEGOLAND Trademark.

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 <legolandnewyorkresortdirect.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Wegroste/

Manuel Wegroste

Sole Panelist

Date: June 15, 2026