

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Mohammad omidi, UAE, Wexlley Matheus, Ian Gabriel Santos, tiktok uk, Eduardo Neves, Chrystian Souza, and junia gracielle
Case No. D2026-2580

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Mohammad omidi, UAE, United Arab Emirates; Wexlley Matheus, Brazil; Ian Gabriel Santos, Brazil; tiktok uk, Brazil; Eduardo Neves, Brazil; Chrystian Souza, Brazil; and junia gracielle, Brazil.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <legobr-trofeudacopa.online>, <legoeditions.shop>, <lego-sitebr.shop>, <legoworldcup.online>, <legoworldcup2026.site>, and <loja-lego.shop> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB.

The disputed domain name <legotoyz.com> is registered with Hello Internet Corp. (collectively referred as the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 12, 2026. On June 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 15, 2026, the Registrar 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 22, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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 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 is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark.

The disputed domain names <legobr-trofeudacopa.online>, <legoeditions.shop>, <lego-sitebr.shop>, <legoworldcup.online>, <legoworldcup2026.site>, <loja-lego.shop>, and <legotoyz.com> were registered on April 6, 2026, April 5, 2026, April 5, 2026, April 4, 2026, April 4, 2026, April 3, 2026, and April 1, 2026, respectively.

All of the disputed domain names, except for <legoworldcup2026.site>, previously resolved to Portuguese-language websites displaying the Complainant’s LEGO trademark and offering the Complainant’s branded products for sale at discounted prices and purportedly imitating the Complainant’s stores.

The disputed domain name <legoworldcup2026.site> resolves to an inactive page.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. 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.

The complete information about the disputed domain names can be found in the following table:

No.	Disputed Domain Name	Date of registration	Registrar	Language of the website
1	<legoeditions.shop>	April 5, 2026	Hostinger Operations, UAB	Portuguese
2	<lego-sitebr.shop>	April 5, 2026	Hostinger Operations, UAB	Portuguese
3	<legotoyz.com>	April 1, 2026	Hello Internet Corp	Portuguese
4	<legoworldcup.online>	April 4, 2026	Hostinger Operations, UAB	Portuguese
5	<loja-lego.shop>	April 3, 2026	Hostinger Operations, UAB	Portuguese
6	<legoworldcup2026.site>	April 4, 2026	Hostinger Operations, UAB	Inactive
7	<legobr-trofeudacopa.online>	April 6, 2026	Hostinger Operations, UAB	Portuguese

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- The dominant element of all seven disputed domain names is "lego," which is identical to the Complainant's LEGO trademark;
- Disputed domain names Nos. 2, 5, and 7 use Portuguese terms related to Brazil, such as "br", "trofeudacopa", "sitebr", and "loja" ("store" in Portuguese);
- Disputed domain names Nos. 1, 2 and 4–7 were all registered with the same registrar, Hostinger operations, UAB;
- All disputed domain names were registered within a short period of four days, between April 1 and April 6, 2026;
- Disputed domain names Nos. 1 and 4 use the same name servers. Likewise, Domain Names Nos. 2 and 5 use the same name servers;
- Disputed domain names Nos. 1–5 and 7 have been used to impersonate the Complainant through similar-looking websites offering for sale the Complainant's LEGO Editions FIFA World Cup sets;
- Disputed domain names Nos. 1–5 and 7 contain Portuguese-language content imitating an official LEGO store;
- The verified Whois information for disputed domain name No. 3, <legotoyz.com>, indicates that its registrant is based in the United Arab Emirates. However, this disputed domain name has also been connected to a Portuguese-language impersonation website targeting the Brazilian market. In addition, the website was practically identical to that previously accessible through disputed domain names Nos. 2 and 4;
- Six of the seven disputed domain names list Brazil as the Respondents' country;
- Six of the seven disputed domain names were registered using generic "@gmail.com" email addresses; and

- Disputed domain name No. 3 (<legotoyz.com>), although registered through a different registrar, resolves to the same website and contains the same content as the remaining disputed domain names except for the disputed domain name <legoworldcup2026.site>.

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.

B. 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 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 like “br”, “trofeudacopa” “editions”, “site”, “toyz”, “worldcup2026”, “loja”, and “worldcup” 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 illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case, 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.

Finally, the composition of the disputed domain names, comprising the Complainant's well known LEGO trademark in its entirety and the addition of the terms like "br", "trofeudacopa" "editions", "site", "toyz", "worldcup2026", "loja", and "worldcup" together with the content related to the Complainant's products and imitating the look and feel of its website signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its LEGO trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and were registered many years after the Complainant had secured trademark protection for those marks.

The Respondent registered seven domain names containing the trademark LEGO within a short time frame of four days. The LEGO trademark is well known, and the disputed domain names combines the Complainant's LEGO and the terms related to the Complainant ("toyz", "editions") or the "World Cup". In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names was not coincidental and was intended to target the Complainant and its trademarks.

The disputed domain name <legoworldcup2026.site> is not in use. However, 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, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed 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 <legobr-trofeudacopa.online>, <legoeditions.shop>, <lego-sitebr.shop>, <legotoyz.com>, <legoworldcup.online>, <legoworldcup2026.site>, and <loja-lego.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2026