

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. Jhon Fredy Leon Garcia
Case No. D2026-3657

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jhon Fredy Leon Garcia, Colombia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lego-tech.online> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 14, 2026. On August 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the 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 August 25, 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 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 August 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on September 25, 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 a member of the Lego Group, the world-famous Danish toy production company founded in 1932 that manufactures LEGO branded toys, consisting mostly of interlocking plastic bricks or blocks. 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 Colombia.

The Complainant and other members of the Lego Group are the proprietors of numerous trademark registrations for LEGO (the "Mark") around the world, including Denmark trademark number VR 1954 00604 registered on May 1, 1954; Colombia trademark number 66251.2 registered on November 30, 1967; and International trademark number 287932 registered on August 27, 1964. It is also the owner of over 6,000 domain names containing the term LEGO, including in particular <lego.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on January 27, 2026. It resolves to a Spanish language website, including "LEGO TECH" in the header, promoting the services (in translation) of "...a creative team specializing in professional photography and audiovisual production for social and corporate events". The website does not provide any information as to the operator of the site save for the name "Lego Tech" and an email address.

The Respondent did not reply to cease and desist letters sent by a representative of the Complainant in February 2026.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its LEGO mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been 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.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".online", the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of a hyphen and the term "tech". The Panel finds that the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but for a website prominently featuring the LEGO mark and promoting and offering photographic and audiovisual services which are in no way associated with or authorised by the Complainant.

Having reviewed the available evidence, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In view of the worldwide fame and notoriety of the Mark, and the absence of any justification for inclusion of the Mark in the Domain Name, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

Furthermore, there can be no doubt that the Respondent registered the Domain Name with the intention that Internet users would be attracted to its website because of the inclusion in the Domain Name of the Mark. The reasonable inference is that the Respondent included the Mark in the Domain Name because it saw it as

of substantial assistance in promoting its business and that the Respondent did so for commercial gain with a view to taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's Rights in the Mark. The Panel can see no conceivable legitimate reason for the Respondent to register or use the Domain Name. Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the website at the Domain Name was associated with, operated or authorised by the Complainant. This indicates bad faith use of the Domain Name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. 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 Domain Name <lego-tech.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2026