

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LEGO Holding A/S v. Payam rahnama

Case No. DIR2026-0002

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Payam rahnama, Iran (Islamic Republic of), self-represented.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <mylego.ir> is registered with IRNIC.

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 5, 2026. On January 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to IRNIC a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 6, 2026, IRNIC transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 6, 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 January 7, 2026. Hard copies of the Complaint and amended Complaint were received by the Center on January 26, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint and the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “irDRP”), the Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was February 23, 2026. On February 24, 2026, the Center notified the Respondent’s default.

On March 5, 2026, the proceedings were suspended due to operational circumstances affecting the administration of .IR dispute resolution services, and the proceeding was reinstituted as of June 11, 2026. The Respondent submitted a request for extension of filing Response on June 11, 2026, and the Response due date was extended to June 16, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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 company incorporated in Denmark. It is a manufacturer of construction brick toys and a supplier of other goods and services under the brand and trademark LEGO.

The Complainant is the owner of several hundred trademark registrations, in jurisdictions around the world, comprising or incorporating the mark LEGO. Those registrations include, for example:

- European Union trademark registration number 000039800 for the word mark LEGO, registered on October 5, 1998, in numerous International Classes;
- United States of America trademark registration number 3440698 for the word mark LEGO, registered on June 3, 2008, in International Classes 9, 35, 38 and 41; and
- Iran (Islamic Republic of), trademark registration number 25637 for a trademark LEGO, registered on July 10, 2024, in International Classes 16, 20, 25 and 28.<sup>1</sup>

The Complainant maintains a portfolio of over 6,000 domain names containing the LEGO trademark. It operates a principal website at “[www.lego.com](http://www.lego.com)”.

The Complainant’s LEGO trademark has been found by prior panels under the UDRP to have attained the status of a famous or well known trademark (see e.g. *LEGO Juris A/S v. Level 5 Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1692](#)).

The disputed domain name was created on January 1, 2015, and it was confirmed by the Registry that the current registrant registered the disputed domain name on May 20, 2024.

The Complainant exhibits evidence that (on a date which is unclear) the disputed domain name resolved to a website headed “MY LEGO”, including the strapline “My Lego Online Store”. The website included the wording “wonderful world of Lego. Welcome to the” [sic] and featured a number of construction toy products including buildings and vehicles, generally branded “Mould King”. The website footer stated “MYLEGO – The Wonderful World of Lego Toys”.

---

<sup>1</sup> While the Complainant exhibits an Iran trademark certificate without translation, the Panel has independently established the registration details from publicly available sources: WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8. (While the proceeding falls to be determined under the irDRP as opposed to the Uniform Domain Name Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), the similarities between the policies are such that [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) is nevertheless instructive.).

## 5. Parties' Contentions

### A. Complainant

The Complainant states that it was founded in 1932 and now operates five main hubs, 37 sales offices, five manufacturing facilities and over 500 retail stores around the world. It employs over 28,500 individuals and states that its products are sold in over 130 countries, including Iran. The Complainant submits that its LEGO brand is one of the world's best known and most reputable trademarks, and exhibits evidence of industry recognition and awards.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LEGO trademark. It contends that the addition of the prefix "my" does not detract from the overall impression created by the disputed domain name, and that the country code Top Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".ir" should be disregarded for the purpose of comparison.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has never authorized it to use its LEGO trademark, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent is making neither bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not one of its authorized resellers or licensees, and asserts that the Respondent has deliberately chosen the disputed domain name in order to take advantage of the LEGO trademark to generate traffic to its website. It contends that the Respondent cannot claim to be operating as an independent reseller of the Complainant's products, since its website does not meet the criteria set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). In particular, far from including any disclaimer or other indication that the website has no relationship with the Complainant, the website falsely represents that it is an official or authorized site, e.g., by including terminology such as "The Wonderful Worlds of Lego Toys".

The Complainant asserts that the products featured on the Respondent's website imitate the Complainant's products, and exhibits side-by-side comparisons of LEGO and "Mould King" branded products, including a Colosseum building and McLaren and Porsche sports cars.

The Complainant submits that, at some time after the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain ceased to resolve to any active website. The Complainant contends that a period of inactivity of the disputed domain name also indicates a lack of rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent's part.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith. It states that the Respondent was clearly aware of its LEGO trademark, which is famous worldwide, and registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of an unauthorized commercial website purporting to offer the Complainant's products. It has therefore used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt 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 that website (Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv)). Insofar as the disputed domain name has been inactive for any period, the Complainant argues that this does not prevent a finding of bad faith, particularly in circumstances where the Respondent could not have registered the disputed domain name for any lawful purpose.

The Complainant submits that any delay on its part in bringing the present proceeding is not a bar to its Complaint being upheld ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.17).

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent submits that the disputed domain name was registered, and has been used, for a genuine commercial venture, offering construction toy products to customers in Iran (Islamic Republic of). It states that the products it offered on its website were branded “Mould King”, and denies having offered any LEGO branded items, or that the “Mould King” products were presented as LEGO products. The Respondent exhibits a variety of web pages in support of this contention, including pages showing that the relevant “Mould King” products are available from retailers including Amazon.com.

The Respondent submits that it has never claimed to be the Complainant, affiliated with the Complainant, or an authorized dealer of the Complainant’s products. It states that the term “Lego” is frequently used in Iran (Islamic Republic of), and among Persian speaking consumers, in a generic and descriptive manner, to refer to construction toys generally. It contends that it used the disputed domain name purely in this sense, and not to create the impression of any connection with the Complainant.

The Respondent submits that the disputed domain name has been used only for the purpose of an active retail business, and has never been offered for resale, any fraudulent activity, or otherwise in any deceptive manner. While acknowledging its reference to “Lego Toys” on its website, it repeats that such term was used only to refer to construction toys generally, and not to claim any affiliation with the Complainant.

The Respondent requests the denial of the Complaint.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (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 has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has demonstrated that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in respect of the mark LEGO. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates that trademark, together with the prefix “my”, which does not prevent the Complainant’s trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and the first element under the Policy is established accordingly.

### **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 the 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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case for the purposes of the second element. The Respondent claims in rebuttal to have registered and to be using the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate commercial venture, namely offering construction toys for sale (Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i)). It contends, in particular, that the term LEGO is used generically in Iran (Islamic Republic of), to refer to construction toy products, and that its adoption of that term was not intended to cause confusion with, or otherwise to take advantage of, the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Panel does not see any merit in the Respondent's submissions.

First, the Panel finds that the Complainant's LEGO mark has attained the status of a famous or well known trademark throughout the world. The adoption of that trademark within the disputed domain name therefore carries a risk of implied affiliation with the trademark, regardless of the Respondent's stated intention. There is nothing in the additional dictionary term "my" (or the ccTLD ".ir") to suggest that the disputed domain name is owned or operated by anyone other than the Complainant or an authorized party, and the disputed domain name is therefore inherently deceptive in the Panel's view.

In view of the world famous nature of the Complainant's LEGO trademark, the Panel does not consider it material that the Complainant's Iran (Islamic Republic of) trademark was not registered until 2024, i.e. some nine years after the date of creation of the disputed domain name; in any case, the Complainant has shown that they obtained rights in the LEGO trademark in other jurisdictions since as early as 1998.

Secondly, there is no suggestion that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name legitimately in connection with the sale of Complainant's products, for example, as contemplated by the criteria set out in the *Okidata* case (supra). On the contrary, the Respondent makes clear that, despite adopting the Complainant's LEGO trademark, it does not offer the Complainant's goods, but only the goods of another manufacturer, "Mould King". While the Complainant implies that these goods represent counterfeit versions of the Complainant's products, the Panel does not find that to be the case: it does however appear that they are goods which compete with those of the Complainant, the sale of which cannot constitute a legitimate use of the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and the second element under the Policy is established accordingly.

### **C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith**

While the Respondent claims to be using the Complainant's LEGO mark in a "generic" sense, that is not an assertion that withstands scrutiny in view of the well known nature of the LEGO trademark. Moreover, the Respondent's assertion is inconsistent with the references on its website to "the wonderful world of Lego" (although those words are misordered) and "The Wonderful World of Lego Toys". Plainly these words imply an association with the Complainant's well known LEGO products, and to the extent that the Respondent's website offers competing products, this comprises a bad faith "bait and switch" operation in the Panel's view.

Furthermore, even on the Respondent's own case, any use of the Complainant's LEGO trademark in a "generic" sense, e.g. to offer competing products, would risk diluting the distinctive nature of that trademark, and would therefore, in the view of the Panel, amount to bad faith conduct causing an unfair detriment to the Complainant.

In the circumstances, the Panel has no hesitation in concluding that the Respondent both registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith (although only one of these two elements is required under the Policy) and that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's

trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv)).

The Panel therefore finds that the third element under the Policy is established.

## **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 <mylego.ir> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Steven A. Maier /*

**Steven A. Maier**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 7, 2026