

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lego Holding A/S v. bastien baleur, Lego univers
Case No. D2026-2701

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is bastien baleur, Lego univers, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legounivers.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 22, 2026. On June 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 22, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0177757342) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 24, 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 June 26, 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 July 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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 the owner of the LEGO trademark used in connection with the famous LEGO construction toys and other LEGO branded products. Founded in 1932, the Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world. The Complainant has over 500 retail stores and employs more than 33,800 individuals. LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including France.

The Complainant is the owner of a very extensive registered trademark portfolio for LEGO (hereafter “the LEGO Trademark” or “the Trademark”), including:

- The Danish trademark registration no. VR 195400604 for LEGO (word mark), registered on May 1, 1954;
- The European Union trademark registration no. 39800 for LEGO (word mark) registered on October 5, 1998.
- The French trademark registration no. 1262807 for LEGO (word mark), filed on February 28, 1984;

The Complainant is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO Trademark, including <lego.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 15, 2026. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name directs to an commercial website purportedly offering LEGO products and prominently displaying the Complainant’s LEGO Trademark. The Complainant first tried to contact the Respondent on April 28, 2026, through a cease-and-desist letter sent by email. In spite of the two reminders sent in May 2026, no reply was received. At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name directs to a page displaying a message (in French) that the webshop under the disputed domain name is currently unavailable (“cette boutique est actuellement indisponible”), together with explanations on how to try to reach the webshop.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s well-known LEGO Trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the LEGO Trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term “univers” does not detract the confusing similarity, as confusing similarity is generally recognized when well-known trademarks (like the LEGO Trademark) are paired up with different kinds of generic prefixes and suffixes (which is the case here as “univers” is the French word for “universe”). The addition of the generic Top-Level domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is irrelevant to determine the confusing similarity between the Trademark and the disputed domain name.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in 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. Neither has the Complainant found anything

that would suggest that the Respondent has been using LEGO in any other way that would give him any legitimate rights in the name. No license or authorization of any other kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent, to use the LEGO Trademark. Further, the Respondent is not an authorized dealer of the Complainant's products and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent does not qualify under the criteria laid down in the Oki Data Test (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)): the Respondent does not disclose the relationship, or lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant, and does convey the false impression that the Respondent is authorized to use the Complainant's Trademark. Accordingly, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the registration of the LEGO Trademark in France (where the Respondent purportedly resides) and in other countries. It is obvious that it is the fame of the Trademark that has motivated the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has employed a privacy service to hide its identity, which is a further evidence of bad faith.

Concerning the use in bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is currently connected to an unauthorized commercial website offering LEGO products. The Complainant's logotype is prominently displayed on the website, contributing to creating a confusing similarity with the Complainant. Consequently, the Respondent is using 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 Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of his website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (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 was 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 entirety of the LEGO Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here “univers” (French word for “universe”), may bear on the 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 Trademark for the purposes of the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.).

Further, the gTLD “.com” is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded in the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

According to the Complaint, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, the Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. The Respondent is not an authorized distributor of the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either. On the contrary, the Panel first notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the well-known LEGO Trademark with the mere addition of the descriptive term “univers”, which in French means “universe”. Internet users will be falsely induced to believe that the disputed domain name refers to a website displaying the “LEGO Universe” and is affiliated or sponsored by the Complainant. As a result, the disputed domain name in itself carries a risk of implied affiliation, which cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. The Respondent’s use of “Lego univers” as the organization name when registering the disputed domain name does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of this case.

The Panel further notes the impersonating nature of the content exhibited on the website at the disputed domain name: the website prominently reproduces the LEGO Trademark, uses the same red color in the banner as the LEGO logotype, displays the sentences “discover our LEGO universe” and “join our LEGO community” (suggesting that it is an official LEGO website), displays pictures of the Complainant’s products and sells these products at highly discounted prices compared to the prices of these products on the

Complainant's official website. In the Panel's view, these elements demonstrate that the disputed domain name is being used for an online shop intended to deceive consumers seeking the Complainant's products. The Respondent induces Internet users into falsely believing that the disputed domain name resolves to a website operated or endorsed by the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, 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.

Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Panel notes that the Respondent has composed the disputed domain name by reproducing the LEGO Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the French term "univers" (meaning "universe" in English). Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly where the complainant's trademark is widely known as it is the case here, and the respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the trademark, panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2. Taking into account the reputation of the Complainants' LEGO Trademark, registered decades before the disputed domain name (including in France, where the Respondent is reportedly located) and widely used worldwide (including on the Internet), the Panel takes the view that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's LEGO Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name and registered it with the intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that, as explained above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website impersonating the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering plastic construction toys. As explained above, the Respondent passes itself off as the Complainant: the website prominently depicts the LEGO Trademark and logo, uses the same red color, offers products under the LEGO Trademark that are identical to the Complainants products, using the same pictures as on the Complainant's official website. The products are however offered for sale at highly discounted prices compared to the prices on the Complainant's official website. According to the Complaint, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, the latter is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant. From the evidence filed, it appears however that the website under the disputed domain name does not contain any disclaimer explaining the (absence of) relationship with the Complainant. In light of this, it seems inconceivable that the Respondent would have registered and used the disputed domain name for a reason other than seeking to unduly benefit from the Complainant, its well-known LEGO Trademark, and associated goodwill.

At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name directs to a page displaying a message (in French) that the website is currently unavailable ("cette boutique est actuellement indisponible"). 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 well-known character of the Complainant's LEGO Trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name (including the well-known LEGO Trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "univers"), and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name at the date of the Decision does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <legounivers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mireille Buydens/

Mireille Buydens

Sole Panelist

Date: August 13, 2026