ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
LEGO Holding A/S v. Bruna Rubilar, BR Group
Case No. D2026-3249

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Bruna Rubilar, BR Group, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <promotoyslego.shop> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 23, 2026. On July 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 26, 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 27, 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Eric Macramalla as the sole panelist in this matter on September 1, 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

Founded in 1932, the Complainant is the owner of the LEGO trademark used in association with, in part, construction toys consisting of interlocking plastic bricks. The Complainant operates throughout the world, which includes five main hubs, six manufacturing sites and over 500 retail stores. The Complainant employs more than 33,800 people and its LEGO-branded products are sold in more than 130 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations around the world comprised of, or containing, LEGO (the "LEGO Trademarks"), including the following:

(a) LEGO, United States of America Registration No. 4395578 filed for use in association with Classes 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 28, and registered on September 3, 2013.

(b) LEGO, Canadian Registration No. TMA106457 filed for use in association with Classes 7, 9, 12, 16, 20, and 28, and registered on April 26, 1957.

(c) LEGO, Australian Registration No. 129258 filed for use in association with Class 28, and registered on September 17, 1956.

The Complainant is the owner of more than 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark. Among these domain names is <lego.com>, which was registered on August 22, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 6, 2026 and is currently inactive. The disputed domain name previously resolved to an unauthorized commercial website purportedly offering LEGO products. The Complainant's logo was prominently displayed on the website in association with the promotion and sale of FIFA World Cup "collab edition" LEGO products.

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.

The Complainant has alleged that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LEGO Trademarks in which it has rights. The Respondent has incorporated the whole of the LEGO trademark in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as contemplated by paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the LEGO Trademarks and is not otherwise connected to the Respondent. The Respondent's activities do not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith as per paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed a complainant must establish the following:

(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.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems 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 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 established rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1. The Complainant has established rights in the LEGO Trademarks in light of its numerous trademark registrations.

Numerous panels have found that the LEGO trademark is famous and highly distinctive (*LEGO Juris A/S v. Level 5 Corp*, WIPO Case No. D2008-1692; *LEGO Juris A/S v. Michael Longo*, WIPO Case No. D2008 1715; *LEGO Juris A/S v. Reginald Hastings Jr.*, WIPO Case No. D2009-0680).

The disputed domain name incorporates the whole of the famous LEGO trademark, which is plainly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "promotoys" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 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 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 provide 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, on a balance of probabilities, that 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 Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted, the Respondent to use the LEGO Trademarks in any manner, including as part of a domain name. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is also no basis to conclude that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. There is also no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The inclusion of the non-distinctive term "promotoys" further supports the Panel's finding that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name previously resolved to an unauthorized commercial website purportedly offering LEGO products, demonstrating that the Respondent was using the disputed domain name in connection with the sale of the Complainant's products without authorization. In light of the Complainant's fame and longstanding reputation in the toy industry, the Respondent's deliberate incorporation of the term "promotoys" was plainly designed to mislead and deceive end users as to source or sponsorship. The Panel finds that such conduct wholly undermines any claim of rights or a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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.

While 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, other circumstances may also 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.

In the present case, the Respondent misappropriated the Complainant's trademark rights with a view to misleading potential consumers as to source or sponsorship. The Respondent previously used the disputed domain name in association with an unauthorized commercial website purportedly offering LEGO products and featuring the Complainant's famous LEGO design trademark. The Respondent has, for financial gain, gone to significant lengths to create the overall commercial impression that it was authorized by the Complainant, or otherwise connected to it. The Respondent's conduct bears the hallmarks of passing off. Panels have held that passing off constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy). This constitutes evidence of the registration and use of a disputed domain name in bad faith.

The disputed domain name is no longer in active use. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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.

The disputed domain name, which was registered decades after the Complainant registered its LEGO trademark, is confusingly similar to the LEGO Trademarks and, if use were to resume, would likely cause confusion among Internet users as to the source, affiliation, or sponsorship. Having considered the reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainant's LEGO trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

Therefore, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the 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 <promotoyslego.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Eric Macramalla/
Eric Macramalla
Sole Panelist
Date: September 15, 2026