

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rexel Developpement SAS v. Akin Odedina, Afric Weddings
Case No. D2025-0596

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rexel Developpement SAS, France, represented by Denнемeyer & Associates S.A., France.

The Respondent is Akin Odedina, Afric Weddings, United Kingdom, represented by Motsnyi Legal, Serbia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rexelcyber.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 February 14, 2025. On February 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 14, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0164686627) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 17, 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 February 17, 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 February 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 11, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on March 11, 2025.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on March 18, 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 an international electrical products and services company established under French law in 1967 and headquartered in Paris. The Complainant operates a website in English and French at the domain name <rexel.com>, with linked social media sites. With nearly 2,000 branches and 27,000 employees in 19 countries (according to its website), the Complainant generated more than EUR 19 billion in group sales in 2023. Its customers are electrical installers as well as public and private businesses and industrial companies. The Complainant has been operating branches in the United Kingdom, where the Respondent is located, since 1947. The United Kingdom subsidiary has a dedicated website at the domain name <rexel.co.uk>.

The Complainant holds more than 250 registered REXEL trademarks, including the following United Kingdom registrations:

Mark	Registration Number	Registration Date	Goods or Services
REXEL (word)	UK00905404876	June 10, 2009	International Classes 9, 11, 35, 36, 37, 42
REXEL (figurative; white letters on blue background)	UK00905404918	June 16, 2009	International Classes 9, 11, 35, 36, 37, 42
REXEL (word)	UK00913334537	February 27, 2015	International Classes 9, 35, 42

The services offered by the Complainant and covered by its registered REXEL mark include the protection and remote monitoring of persons and property, building and industrial automation, and technical consultancy.

The Registrar reports that the disputed domain name was created on June 27, 2022, and is registered to the Respondent Akin Odedina, listing his organization as Afric Weddings and showing a postal address in Devonshire in the United Kingdom and a contact email address using the domain name <africweddings.com>. That domain name produces only a security error message at the time of this Decision. Screenshots found through the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine show that this domain name was formerly associated with a website headed "Afric Weddings" that advertised the offerings of African wedding vendors and event planners.

The disputed domain name, however, presently resolves to a website (the "Respondent's website") headed "Rexel Cyber" with the tagline "A Cyber Security Firm You Can Trust". The website advertises "complete cyber security" services including penetration testing, data privacy, third-party supply chain management, and expert cyber security, displaying the logos of well-known corporate "Clients We Have Worked With". The Respondent's website invites contact by site visitors and displays a contact address in Dartford in the United Kingdom.

The Complainant sent cease and desist letters to the Respondent at the address listed on the Respondent's website and to another address found on the Companies House register, but received no reply. This proceeding followed.

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 its registered REXEL trademark. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no association with the Complainant and no permission to use the Complainant's REXEL mark. Instead, according to the Complainant, the Respondent uses a confusingly similar domain name and a blue website color scheme, similar to the Complainant's, to mimic the Complainant's website and offer similar cyber security services, thus increasing the likelihood of confusion, misleading the public, and tarnishing the Complainant's reputation. The Complainant argues that the Respondent's failure to respond to its cease and desist letters is also "clear evidence" of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Response was filed only on behalf of the Respondent Akin Odedina.

The Respondent does not dispute that the Complainant holds REXEL trademarks but argues that the Respondent Mr. Odedina has a legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name in good faith to refer to his business activities in association with "Rexel" companies in the United Kingdom since 2022. The Response characterizes Mr. Odedina as an "entrepreneur, cybersecurity and tech expert, consultant and trainer" involved in a number of businesses, including "Rexel Cybersecurity Limited", which is currently operating the website associated with the disputed domain name. The Respondent states that he is a consultant at Rexel Cybersecurity Limited, a United Kingdom company incorporated on January 19, 2024 (as shown in its Companies House listing). This is consistent with his social media profiles attached to the Response. Previously, the Respondent was involved in a company called "Rexel Cyber Consulting Ltd", incorporated on June 30, 2022, a few days after the registration of the disputed domain name, and dissolved on December 5, 2023 (again, as recorded on the Companies House registry). It appears from attachments to the Response that the Respondent Mr. Odedina speaks at events and offers training to individuals seeking careers in information security, and he also operates a YouTube channel with more than 2,500 subscribers.

The Response attaches the Declaration of Eniola Odedina, the Director of Rexel Cybersecurity Limited, stating that the Respondent Mr. Odedina registered the disputed domain name in the interests of the Rexel Cyber Consulting business and continues to use it for the benefit of Rexel Cybersecurity Limited. Another current project of the business is called "Rexel Cyber Academy", which has its own website at the domain name <www.rexelcyberacademy.com>. Mr. Odedina is listed as a lead trainer at the academy. The Response characterizes Rexel Cybersecurity Limited as the "[c]urrent beneficial owner of the disputed domain name" and argues that the ongoing use of the disputed domain name for a genuine cybersecurity consulting and training business demonstrates a legitimate interest for purposes of the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i).

The Respondent denies bad faith, arguing that he operates in a different field of business (cybersecurity) than the Complainant's electrical equipment distribution business. While the Complainant may offer some security services, the Respondent argues, these are limited and do not overlap with the Respondent's cybersecurity services. The Respondent points to examples of other companies operating in the United Kingdom with a "Rexel" name or mark for other goods or services and states that because of the difference in services offered, the Respondent did not consider itself a competitor or infringer vis-à-vis the Complainant, and therefore did not feel obliged to reply to the Complainant's cease and desist letter. The Respondent denies any intent to create confusion with the Complainant and submits that merely using the color blue on its website is insufficient to engender such confusion.

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 (the registered REXEL marks) 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 name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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, "cyber") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of services, in accord with the example of legitimate interests given in the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2. The Panel notes that the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a "coming soon" message in 2022 and 2023, but by May 2024 the Respondent's "Rexel Cyber" website was published, offering a range of cybersecurity services as described above. There is some blue lettering and background on the website, but it is not visibly imitative of the Complainant's website, and it does not bear indicia of a fraudulent website. The website operator is listed with contact details, and it is a company registered in the United Kingdom with Companies House. The Complainant does not furnish evidence that the named client references are fraudulent. Social media posts, events announcements, and the Declaration of company director Eniola Odedina support the statements in the Response concerning the involvement of the Respondent Mr. Odedina with the company and the website.

The Complainant suggests that the Respondent's company name itself was illegitimately selected in an attempt to exploit the Complainant's reputation, and thus that the website offerings under that name are not "bona fide". In the Panel's view the record does not support such an inference. The Complainant's mark is well established but not in the cybersecurity consulting service market, and others in the United Kingdom also use the name "Rexel", for a variety of products and services. Thus, there is not a compelling reason to assume that the Respondent meant to create a false association with the Complainant by registering a succession of "Rexel" companies and domain names as it did.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the Panel's finding on the second element, it is not necessary to enter a finding on the third.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2025