

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Alex Lin

Case No. D2026-3634

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Alex Lin, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <crocslego.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 13, 2026. On August 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 14, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 17, 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 August 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on September 29, 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 well-known LEGO trademark which is commonly known in relation to construction toys. The Complainant owns trademark registrations for LEGO worldwide, including Republic of Korea Trademark Registration 4100125050000, registered on September 20, 2001, for LEGO, covering protection for various services in classes 36, 41 and 42.

The Complainant further owns more than 6,000 domain names consisting of or comprising the LEGO trademark. Among these domain names is <lego.com>, which was registered back in 1995.

On January 23, 2026, the Complainant announced a multi-year collaboration and partnership with the company Crocs Group.

The Respondent is reportedly located in the Republic of Korea.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 24, 2026.

According to the undisputed evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a website which purportedly offers virtual human resources ("HR") assistant services. The associated website does not contain any visible disclaimer describing the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant.

On February 16, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. The Respondent, however, did not reply to the Complainant's correspondence.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint 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.

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

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured 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 the LEGO trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms, here "crops", which is another well-known trademark primarily for shoes of a third party not involved to the present administrative proceedings, 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.

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. Particularly, the Complainant put forward that the Respondent is neither a business partner of the Complainant nor a licensee of its LEGO trademark and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the term "cropslego". 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 Panel also notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that purportedly offers HR assistant services, which additionally does not support a finding of any rights or legitimate interests under the circumstances of this case.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have had the Complainant and its LEGO trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel considers that the Respondent deliberately chose the disputed domain name, which incorporates the LEGO trademark in its entirety, and is likely to attract Internet users and unduly benefit from the reputation associated with the Complainant's trademark. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name was registered only one day after the Complainant announced a multi-year partnership with the well-known company Crocs, Inc., whose CROCS trademark forms the first part of the disputed domain name. The timing of the registration, together with the combination of the LEGO and CROCS trademarks in the disputed domain name, further suggests that the Respondent was aware of the announced partnership and specifically targeted it when registering the disputed domain name. In view of the Panel, all this supports the finding of bad faith registration.

As to the use in bad faith, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering virtual HR assistant services, which are unrelated to the Complainant. The website does not contain any disclaimer disclosing the lack of a relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. In these circumstances, and particularly in view of the reputation of the Complainant's LEGO trademark, the Panel finds that the Respondent has deliberately used the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LEGO trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and its purportedly offered services.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and to the Complaint, which in view of the Panel additionally provides support for the finding of bad faith.

In light of the above, the Panel concludes the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Requested Remedy

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

As to the findings above, the Complainant has satisfied all three requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

However, the Panel again notes that the disputed domain name incorporates not only the Complainant's LEGO trademark but also the trademark CROCS, which is owned and used by another widely known entity, which is not a party to the present administrative proceedings.

In line with section 4.13 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the Panel believes that a transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant will be efficient and appropriate to the present case.

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 <crocslego.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: October 9, 2026