

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Mathew Simmons

Case No. D2026-2838

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Mathew Simmons, United States of America, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legoapp.net> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 30, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 1, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 1, 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 July 2, 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 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 1, 17, 20 and 27, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center sent an email regarding possible settlement to the Parties. The Parties did not request suspension.

The Center appointed Gökhan Gökçe 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 was founded in 1932 in Denmark and formerly known as LEGO Juris A/S as of January 1, 2025, has unified all formal LEGO branded activities and related rights under one governance structure. The Complainant is the owner of the LEGO mark and is responsible for all LEGO brand operations worldwide, including the development, manufacture, marketing, and sale of LEGO construction toys and related products, as well as the expansion of the LEGO brand into digital content, software, books, and other branded merchandise.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple worldwide registrations for LEGO, including, inter alia, the following registrations in the United States of America:

- United States of America Registration No. 4,395,578 for LEGO, registered on September 3, 2013;
- United States of America Registration No. 2,245,652 for LEGO, registered on May 18, 1999; and
- United States of America Registration No. 2,060,284 for the figurative trademark , registered on May 13, 1997.

Additionally,

- International Trademark Registration No. 287932 for LEGO, registered on August 27, 1964; and
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000039800 for LEGO, registered on October 5, 1998.

The Complainant holds more than 6,000 LEGO related domain names, among other online presence operating the official website on domain name <lego.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 25, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a login and account-registration page for a website branded “BrickBin”, displaying the phrase “Organize your Lego collection”. BrickBin presents itself as an independent retailer that buys, sells, and trades new, used, and retired LEGO-branded sets. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to same website.

The Respondent is reportedly an individual residing within the United States of America. The Complainant, through its representatives, sent cease-and-desist correspondence to the Respondent prior to the filing of the Complaint. No response was received.

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:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions but sent several email communications from July 1 to July 27, 2026.

6. Discussion and Findings

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

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations provided in the Complaint as true. See section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)).

For the evaluation of this case, the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 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 name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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, "app", may bear on 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. In addition, it is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain ".net", can be disregarded in the assessment of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. [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.

In this regard, several circumstances support the Complainant’s prima facie showing:

- There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The underlying registrant information identifies the registrant as “Mathew Simmons”, which bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent has neither acquired nor applied for any trademark corresponding to “LEGO” or any variation thereof.
- The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has no affiliation, authorization, or relationship with the Complainant.

LEGO is a famous trademark worldwide. As no evidence has been found that the Respondent is using the name LEGO as a company name or has any other legal rights in the name, it is quite clear that the Respondent is simply trying to benefit from the Complainant’s world-famous trademark.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a login and account-registration page for a website branded “BrickBin”, displaying the phrase “Organize your Lego collection”. BrickBin is presented as an independent retailer that buys, sells, and trades new, used, and retired LEGO sets. Even assuming that the Respondent offers genuine LEGO products, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not satisfy the cumulative requirements of the *Okidata* test. In particular, the website does not accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent’s lack of any relationship with the Complainant. See *Okidata Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#); [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8. Moreover, the Panel further notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s LEGO trademark in its entirety together with the term “app”. In the context of a website providing access to an online platform concerning LEGO collections and products, the addition of the term “app” reinforces, rather than dispels, the impression that the disputed domain name may designate an official application operated, sponsored, or endorsed by the Complainant. Accordingly, the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation, particularly in view of the distinctive and well-known character of the LEGO trademark worldwide. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 the Respondent clearly had knowledge of the Complainant's famous LEGO brand because the term LEGO was used on the websites at the disputed domain names. As noticed by a few previous panels, the Complainant's LEGO trademark should be considered as a well-known trademark due to its exceptional presence in large part of the world for several decades. See *LEGO Juris A/S v. Kiana Seyfi, Lego*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1166](#); *LEGO Juris A/S v. shilei*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0152](#); *LEGO Juris A/S v. Park KyeongSook*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1195](#); *LEGO Juris A/S v. Viktor Tkachev, Lego Town*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0239](#); *LEGO Juris A/S v. Andrei Novakovich*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1513](#). The Complainant's trademark is one of the most recognizable toy brands in the world and it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the content of the website to which the disputed domain name used to resolve leaves no room for doubt on the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its LEGO trademark and evidence that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name. It should be also borne in mind that that the registration and use of LEGO trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by around 60 years, making it unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Due to the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name resolves to a login and account-registration page for "BrickBin", an independent retailer that purportedly buys, sells, and trades new, used, and retired LEGO sets. The Panel considers that such use is commercial in nature. By incorporating the Complainant's well-known LEGO trademark together with the term "app", the disputed domain name conveys the impression that it leads to an official application operated, sponsored, or endorsed by the Complainant. The website does not contain any clear and prominent disclaimer explaining the lack of a relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such conduct constitutes evidence of registration and uses in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See *Philip Morris Incorporated v. Alex Tsytkin*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0946](#).

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.

The disputed domain name resolves to a login page requesting users' credentials and may mislead Internet users into believing that they are dealing with the Complainant. Although the record does not establish that any credentials have been misused, the risk of misuse and at minimum the Respondent seeking such details for its own benefit while using the Complainant's trademark in the inherently misleading disputed domain name, further supports the finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4; *Canva Pty Ltd. v. Bruno Henrique Lima De Castro*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2347](#).

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 <legoapp.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gökhan Gökçe/

Gökhan Gökçe

Sole Panelist

Date: August 12, 2026.