ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
LEGO Holding A/S v. Adil Achlauchi, Lego Fishing Rod
Case No. D2026-4289

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Adil Achlauchi, Lego Fishing Rod, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legofishing.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 September 23, 2026. On September 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 28, 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 0177744006) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 28, 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 September 30, 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 October 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on October 1 and 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on October 27, 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 manufacturer of construction toys branded LEGO. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LEGO such as United States of America registration No. 1026871, registered on December 9, 1975.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 13, 2026, and redirects to a website that offers flip-flops for sale. Previously, it resolved to a website purporting to offer LEGO fishing rods.

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 a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The dominant part of the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark LEGO. The trademark LEGO is wellknown. The inclusion of the generic term "fishing" does not diminish confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not have an impact on assessing confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use its trademark nor is he an authorized dealer. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Prior to sending a cease-and-desist letter, there was no bona fide offering of goods and services. The current use redirects to content unrelated to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent is using the name LEGO as a company name or has any other legal rights in the name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark is wellknown. The disputed domain name was registered decades after the registration of the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name resolved previously to a website offering LEGO fishing rods. Since the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, the disputed domain name resolves to a website, which offers flip-flops. There is no disclaimer on the website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent instead sent an email dated October 1, 2026, stating his willingness to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant against the payment of EUR 30, which he claims is the cost of the disputed domain name registration. The Respondent further sent another communication on October 10, 2026, stating: "Hello, what is gonna Happen now?"

6. Discussion and Findings

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 mark is reproduced 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, "fishing" 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. 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. Instead, upon notice of the dispute, the Respondent agreed to the transfer of the disputed domain name in exchange for reimbursement of EUR 30. The Panel infers from this communication that the Respondent does not demonstrate having any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent does not object to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

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 must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark as the disputed domain name was registered decades after the registration of the Complainant's trademark, the Complainant's trademark is well-known, and the disputed domain name resolved previously to a website purporting to offer LEGO fishing rods. Through its use, the Panel finds that the Respondent means to create confusion for users intending to find the Complainant, and that 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 mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

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 <legofishing.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/
Nayiri Boghossian
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026