

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Thach Vu Van
Case No. D2026-1926

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Thach Vu Van, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legolandhotelshanghai.com> is registered with Unstoppable Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 5, 2026. On May 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 5, 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 Registrant, Unstoppable Privacy Service LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 11, 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 12, 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on May 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on June 15, 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 construction toys and other products under the LEGO brand. 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. The Complainant employs more than 33,800 individuals and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in China and the United States of America (“United States”).

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations incorporating the marks LEGO and LEGOLAND, including, inter alia:

- United States trademark registration LEGOLAND (word), No. 2334535, registered on March 28, 2000, in classes 35, 41 and 42;
- European Union trademark registration LEGOLAND LEGO (fig.), No. 000107466, registered on January 5, 1999, in classes 9, 16, 18, 20, 21, 25, 28, 30, 41, and 42; and
- International trademark registration LEGOLAND (word), No. 1085328, registered on June 7, 2011, in class 41.

The Complainant is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark, 450 of which contain the LEGOLAND trademark. The Complainant operates, among others, its official domain names <legoland.com> since 1998 and <legolandshanghai.cn> since 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 3, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website presenting itself as an official booking and information page associated with the LEGOLAND Hotel. The website prominently displayed a search interface referencing destination details, check-in and check-out dates, room occupancy information, and included a trip search menu at the top of the page linking to third-party booking services. It further featured a section titled “Happy Customer” showing a rating of 9.5/10 based on numerous reviews. The webpage also included descriptive promotional content for the LEGOLAND Hotel in Shanghai, highlighting themed accommodations and family-oriented attractions, accompanied by images of LEGO-themed buildings and rooms, as well as contact details corresponding to the Complainant. As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

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:

(1) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, since it incorporates the LEGO and LEGOLAND marks and the addition of the terms “hotel” and “shanghai” does not prevent confusion. The geographical term “shanghai” merely describes the location, reinforcing the association the Complainant who is also present in Shanghai, China. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its trademarks;

(2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no license or authorization to use the LEGO and LEGOLAND marks, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent was using a privacy Whois service. The Respondent's website featured images pulled from the Complainant's actual website and also displayed the Complainant's actual address and phone number, all as a means of deceiving internet users into believing that the website was associated with the Complainant. The Respondent was using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to competing ticketing websites. Specifically, the Respondent had posted a trip search menu at the top of the disputed domain name's website, that redirected users to a third-party domain name, Impersonating the Complainant and its authorized service negates any claim of legitimate interests.

(3) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered on April 3, 2026. Registering the disputed domain name so obviously connected to a well-known mark without authorization is itself evidence of bad faith. Since the disputed domain name resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant's logo and contact details, and redirecting Internet users seeking to purchase tickets for the Complainant's LEGOLAND theme park to the competing website, there is strong reason to believe that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent's conduct in presenting itself as the Complainant on the website reinforces this conclusion. Therefore, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website. Such conduct is clearly designed to create a misleading association with the Complainant further reinforces the inference of deliberate targeting.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer the Disputed Domain Name. In UDRP cases, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, the Complainant has to demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (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.

The Respondent was given proper notice of the Complaint and had the opportunity to respond. Under paragraph 5(a) of the Rules, the Respondent was required to submit its response within 20 days of commencement of the proceeding. The Respondent failed to do so.

Pursuant to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the event of such a default, the Panel shall proceed to a decision based on the Complaint. However, the Respondent's default does not mean that the Complainant automatically prevails; the Complainant continues to bear the burden of proof on each element. The Panel

may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's silence, and, where appropriate, accept as true the reasonable allegations in the Complaint that are not contradicted by evidence.

The Panel has reviewed the entire case file and the evidence provided. The Panel is also guided, where pertinent, by the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), which reflects consensus positions of UDRP panels on many common issues. The Panel will make reference to these consensus views in the analysis below as applicable.

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 mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its LEGOLAND mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's LEGOLAND mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's LEGOLAND mark in its entirety, with the only differences being the addition of the descriptive term "hotel" and geographical term "shanghai". In accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8, addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the gTLD ".com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally ignored for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's marks to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 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 evidence before the Panel shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in a manner that targets and incorporates the Complainant and its LEGOLAND trademark, including by reproducing it in its entirety within the disputed domain name and in associated website content. At the time relevant to the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website presenting itself as an official booking page for the LEGOLAND Hotel, displaying a hotel search interface and promotional content, while incorporating the

Complainant's materials and providing links redirecting users to third-party booking services. The Panel notes that such use is not supported by any authorization from the Complainant and creates a risk of implied affiliation.

In addition, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to third-party ticketing platforms, further demonstrating a commercial intent to exploit the Complainant's goodwill. There is no evidence that the Respondent made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate offering. Nor does the Respondent's conduct qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, in the absence of any legitimate use, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in LEGOLAND trademark and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademarks. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

In light of the Respondent's failure to participate in the proceedings, the absence of any credible evidence of rights or legitimate interests, and the clear intent to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant's trademarks, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 finds that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant operates globally under the distinctive and well-known LEGO and LEGOLAND trademarks. The Complainant is a globally recognized company in the toy and entertainment industry, known for developing themed attractions and hotels, enjoying substantial reputation and goodwill worldwide. The Complainant also operates the domain name <legolandshanghai.cn>.

Given the international reputation of the Complainant and the coined nature of the LEGOLAND trademark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the LEGOLAND trademark in its entirety, adding only the non-distinctive terms "hotel" and "shanghai", a composition which strongly supports a finding of deliberate targeting. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By registering the disputed domain name that wholly incorporates the Complainant's well-known LEGOLAND trademark together with the terms "hotel" and "shanghai", redirecting internet users looking to purchase tickets to the Complainant's LEGOLAND theme park, to the competing third-party website, the Respondent has created a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name. Such composition inherently suggests an association with the Complainant and constitutes an intentional attempt to exploit the goodwill of the Complainant's trademarks.

The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant's rights in the trademark LEGOLAND were established. Although at the time of the Decision the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, panels have consistently held that passive holding does not preclude a finding of bad faith. Considering the reputation of the Complainant's marks, the composition of the disputed domain

name, and the Respondent's failure to submit any Response, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name in this case supports, rather than negates, a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. See *BioNTech SE v. Joseph, [dRIME] [OMNX Inc.]*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3388](#).

The Respondent has provided no explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademarks. The absence of any Response further reinforces the Panel's inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

Having regard to the totality of the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, 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 <legolandhotelshanghai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/

Ganna Prokhorova

Sole Panelist

Date: June 25, 2026