

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Holding A/S v. reiju gbo
Case No. DTV2025-0003

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is reiju gbo, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legomasters.tv> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 3, 2025. On June 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 3, 2025, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 2025, 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 June 4, 2025.

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 June 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar as the sole panelist in this matter on July 7, 2025. 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 Danish company founded in 1932 involved in the business of construction toys and other products under the brand name “LEGO”. The Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world and products of the Complainant are sold in more than 130 countries including Indonesia where the Respondent is supposedly based out of, as per the Whois details.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the trademark LEGO and its formative marks over several jurisdictions including the following:

- (i) LEGO word mark bearing registration number 604-1954 registered on October 30, 1953, under Class 28 in Denmark
- (ii) LEGO word mark bearing registration number 1018875 registered on August 26, 1975, under Class 28 in the United States of America
- (iii) LEGO word mark bearing registration number IDM000349055 registered on August 31, 1977, under Class 28 in Indonesia

The Complainant is the owner of various domain names containing the mark LEGO including the domain name <lego.com>. It is pertinent to note that the Complainant is also the registered proprietor of the mark LEGO MASTERS in China bearing registration number 38863474, registered April 14, 2020, under Class 41. The trademark LEGO MASTERS is used by the Complainant in relation to its television series connected to Lego brands aired in United Kingdom and the United States of America.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 27, 2024. The disputed domain name is redirected to a website “www.nativewomenrunning.com” advertising online betting and gambling games. The Respondent is apparently located in Indonesia and did not submit any Response to the Complaint.

A cease-and-desist notice was sent by the Complainant on March 5, 2025, and no response was allegedly received from the Respondent.

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 dominant part of the disputed domain name contains “LEGO” which is identical to the registered trademark of the Complainant. The disputed domain name consists of the additional term “masters” which does not diminish the confusing similarity between the Complainant’s LEGO mark and the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s registered well-known trademark to merely generate traffic to its website, the content of which is not related to the Complainant or its products.
- The LEGO mark of the Complainant is well-known amongst the public and the registrations of the Complainant’s mark pre-date the date of registration of the disputed domain name which evidences

that the Respondent was well-aware of the Complainant and has merely adopted the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to its 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 disputed domain name is thus registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the registered trademark LEGO MASTERS is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds 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 the Respondent to use the LEGO mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been known by the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Respondent is not licensed or authorized by the Complainant to carry any gaming activities under its brand name and has never had any form of business relationship with 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 has adopted the disputed domain name containing the well-known and distinctive mark of the Complainant evidencing that the Respondent was well-aware of the Complainant's marks and the registration of the domain was merely to unjustly enrich itself based on the reputation of the Complainant. Further, the disputed domain name redirects to a website that offers services unrelated to the Complainant.

The Panel also cannot ignore the fact that the Respondent has registered a ".tv" extension for the disputed domain containing "LEGO MASTERS" which is in fact connected to a television series premiered by the Complainant in relation to its products under the "LEGO" and "LEGO MASTERS" brand. This invariably points towards the bad faith registration of the Respondent.

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 <legomasters.tv> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar/

Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar

Sole Panelist

Date: July 21, 2025