ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Jeffrey Walters, Daniel Alber
Case No. D2026-2536

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Jeffrey Walters, and Daniel Alber, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <legobricksstore.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V.

The disputed domain name <legoofficialstore.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc.

Realtime Register B.V. and Dynadot Inc. are hereinafter referred to as the "Registrars".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 11, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 12, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot and REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 15, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 18, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Haig Oghigian as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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, LEGO Holding A/S, is a Danish company specialized in construction toys and related products. Founded in 1932, the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world including: five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs more than 33,800 individuals and its products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in the United States and Denmark.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for "LEGO", such as but not limited to:

Trademark	Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date
LEGO	United States	4395578	September 3, 2013
	European Union	002829463	January 7, 2004

The Complainant operates its main website at "www.lego.com".

The disputed domain names <legoofficialstore.com> and <legobricksstore.com> were registered on May 1, 2026 and May 12, 2026, respectively. At the time of filing of this Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to highly similar websites, displaying the Complainant's trademark and an image stating "Official LEGO® Store", and purportedly offering the Complainant's LEGO products for sale.

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 names.

- The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LEGO, which have been recognized as well recognized by past panels on multiple occasions. The Complaint states that the relevant trademark, LEGO, is reproduced in the disputed domain names, and therefore the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the LEGO mark. The Complainant submits that the LEGO trademark is fully reproduced in the disputed domain names and the addition of the terms "official store" and "bricks store" do not detract from the overall impression of confusing similarity with the LEGO brand. The Complainant adds that addition of these terms to the disputed domain names to further adds to the confusing similarity, given that the terms "official store" imply that this disputed domain name resolves to the official store of a given brand. The Complainant further adds that given the disputed domain names resolve to a web store which reproduces the Complainant's marks and colour scheme, and that purports to offer the Complainant's products for sale, the risk of confusion among consumers is greater.

- The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant argues that as they have demonstrated rights to the mark contained within the disputed domain names, and has never licensed the mark to the Respondents nor endorsed the mark's use by the Respondents, meaning that the Respondents cannot have used the mark with permission. The Complaint further states that there is no record of the Respondent being commonly known by any terms contained in the disputed domain names, and as such the Respondents would have no reason to choose such a name unless the Respondents were seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the Respondents could not have been unaware of the Complainant, or its marks, given the established renown of the Complainant. The Complainant further adds that the Respondents were using the disputed domain names to offer the Complainant's products, stating that they are an authorized reseller when in fact they are not an authorized reseller; this activity both demonstrates the Respondents' knowledge of the Complainant and the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names in a manner which does not constitute bona fide use. The Complainant further notes the website invites visitors to sign in by providing their email and password as well as other personal information, and states that they suspect due to the illegitimacy of the website, the Respondents' purpose is to fool unsuspecting visitors into divulging their personal information by appearing to be authorized by the Complainant, while requesting the email address of unsuspecting Internet users. Thus, the Complainant accuses the Respondents of using the websites at which the disputed domain names resolve to take advantage of the fame of Complainant's trademarks and the trust and goodwill that Complainant has fostered among consumers to, at minimum, illegitimately increase traffic to Respondents' website for personal gain, and at worst, "phish" personal information from the Complainant's customers (in the event that the Respondents seek to obtain visitors' personal information as part of a larger scheme to perpetrate fraud by exploiting the fraudulently acquired personal information to, perhaps, acquire sensitive financial information).

- The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's mark, while having no relationship to that mark even though the Respondents should have been aware of the Complainant due to their established brand, global recognition and numerous trademark registrations, and therefore constitutes bad faith registration. The Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondents were using the disputed domain names to offer the Complainant's products while stating that the Respondents were authorized reseller when this was not the case, which shows clear bad faith registration and use. Additionally, the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain names are also currently set up with mail exchange ("MX") records, meaning the disputed domain names may be actively used for email purposes. The Complainant argues that emails emanating from the disputed domain names could not reasonably be used for any good faith purpose given circumstances of the use of the disputed domain names, and that it is likely that the disputed domain names may be actively used to facilitate fraudulent activity such as phishing, impersonating or passing off as the Complainant.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the two disputed domain names both resolve to highly similar websites built most likely using the same template, based off the Complainant's own primary web store and that both were registered by the Respondents using the same phone number and similar email addresses, according to the information provided by the Registrars.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 "official store" and "bricks store", 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 names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that by registering and using the disputed domain names, the Respondent attempted to recreate the Complainant's web shop, and reproduced the Complainant's marks in the disputed domain names and on the associated websites without authorization, to create the impression that the Respondent was affiliated with the Complainant when this was not the case. The Respondent further directly claims to be the official LEGO store on the websites at the disputed domain names, despite this being untrue. The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent intended to mislead consumers into making purchases on the websites thinking they were engaging either with the Complainant or an authorized reseller when in reality the Respondent was neither.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute 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 names <legobricksstore.com> and <legoofficialstore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Haig Oghigian/
Haig Oghigian
Sole Panelist
Date: August 5, 2026