

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGO Juris A/S v. FLWEBS Private Registration Case No. D2024-1733

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is FLWEBS Private Registration, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <legostorenearme.com> and <legostoresnearme.com> are registered with eNom, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 25, 2024. On April 25, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 25, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 May 3, 2024, 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 May 8, 2024.

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 May 10, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 30, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 31, 2024. After the Notification of Respondent Default was made by the Center, the Respondent made an informal communication via email on May 31, 2024.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 2024. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), “to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent”. Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreements, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is LEGO Juris A/S, a Danish company mainly operating in the field of construction toys and owning several trademark registrations for LEGO, among which:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1018875 for LEGO, registered on August 26, 1975;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000039800 for LEGO, registered on October 5, 1998;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00000844309 for LEGO, registered on January 25, 1963.

The Complainant operates on the Internet at the main website “www.lego.com”, as well as with many other generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”) and country code Top-Level Domains (“ccTLDs”) including the trademark LEGO.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain names were both registered on January 30, 2024, and they both redirect to the webpage at “https://floridamanstoys.com/pages/lego-near-me”, in which the Complainant’s trademark and logo are reproduced, as well as a variation of the Complainant’s red and yellow LEGO logotype in the masthead, and goods bearing the Complainant’s trademark are offered for sale.

On February 23, 2024, March 1, 2024, and March 8, 2024 the Complainant’s legal representatives sent a cease-and-desist letter by email to the Respondent, without receiving any reply.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its trademark LEGO, as the disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Complainant’s trademark, with the addition of the terms “store”, “stores”, “near,” and “me”.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain names

or to use its trademark within the disputed domain names, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names redirect to a webpage in which the Complainant's trademark and logo are reproduced and goods bearing the Complainant's trademark are offered for sale.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark LEGO is well-known. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

After the Notification of Respondent Default was made by the Center, the Respondent made an informal communication via email on May 31, 2024, stating "Hello. I have not received a notice. Please resend any information previously send to this email. We will respond immediately. Thank You."

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. [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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "store", "stores", "near" and "me", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a gTLD, in this case “.com”, is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, UDRP panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names redirect to a website which offers for sale the Complainant’s products; this is however done using the Complaint’s trademark both on the website and in the disputed domain names, creating the false impression that the website is sponsored by the Complainant, which is not accurate. Had the Respondent been forthcoming about its lack of relationship with the Complainant, a different (fair use) analysis may very well apply; that is not however the case here.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant’s cease and desist letters.

Accordingly, 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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark LEGO is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent plainly knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the confusingly similar disputed domain names, especially because the website to which the disputed domain names redirect is reproducing the Complainant’s trademark and logo, as well as a variation of the Complainant’s red and yellow LEGO logotype in the masthead, and offering for sale goods bearing the Complainant’s trademark, thereby giving the false impression that the website is associated with the Complainant.

Further, UDRP Panels have [...] found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: [...] redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names are also used in bad faith, since the Respondent is intentionally attempting to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the disputed domain names' source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been 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 names <legostorenearme.com> and <legostoresnearme.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2024