

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rexel Developpement SAS v. the namegame, TheNameGame
Case No. DAI2026-0073

1. The Parties

Complainant is Rexel Developpement SAS, France, represented by IP Twins SAS, France.

Respondent is the namegame, TheNameGame, United Kingdom ("UK").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rexel.ai> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 23, 2026. On July 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 27, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 29, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on August 12, 2026. Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing on August 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott as the sole panelist in this matter on August 28, 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.

The Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, dated September 14, 2026, notifying the Parties that it had elected to accept Complainant's Supplemental Filing insofar as it addressed factual allegations by Respondent that Complainant could not reasonably have foreseen when it filed its Complaint. The Panel authorized Respondent to submit a responsive pleading by September 19, 2026. Respondent filed a Supplemental Submission dated September 16, 2026. The Panel has accepted that submission.

The Panel notes that certain annexes mentioned in Respondent's submission dated September 16, 2026 were not provided by Respondent. Accordingly, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 2, dated September 30, 2026, requesting Respondent to provide the missing annexes. Email communications were received from Respondent between October 1 and October 7, 2026, including missing annexes.

4. Factual Background

Complainant is registered as a business organization in Paris, France, with offices in Paris. It is part of the Rexel Group, a multinational distributor of electrical products, services and solutions for the industrial, commercial and residential markets.¹ In 2024, sales from the Rexel Group reached more than 19 billion euros worldwide. The Rexel Group counts more than 1,800 branches and 68 logistical centers spread across 17 countries, including the United Kingdom. Shares of Rexel Group trade on the Euronext exchange under the ticker symbol RXL, with a market capitalization as of September 2026 exceeding EUR 10 billion. Complainant operates a commercial website at the domain name <rexel.com>. Complainant has introduced substantial AI capability into its operations that are detailed in various media reports regarding its products and services. Complainant offers an application, RexelGPT, on Google Play store described as: "your dedicated AI assistant designed to support Rexel teams across various functions and topics".

Complainant is the owner of registration for the word trademark REXEL on the register of the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), registration number 005404876, registration dated June 10, 2009, in international classes (ICs) 9, 11, 35, 36, 37, and 42, covering, inter alia, electric apparatus and instruments, lighting apparatus, wholesale and retail sales services, including via telecommunications and/or computer networks, financial, monetary and real estate affairs, installation maintenance and repair of electrical apparatus and installations, and technical advice, consultancy and research in the field of electrical equipment, all as further specified. Complainant is the owner of registration for the word trademark REXEL on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), registration number 3656343, registration dated July 21, 2009, in ICs 35, 36, 37, and 42. Complainant is the owner of registration for the word trademark REXEL on the trademark register of the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (UKIPO), registration number UK 00905404876, registration dated June 10, 2009, in ICs 9, 11, 35, 36, 37, and 42. Complainant has provided information regarding numerous additional REXEL word and word and design/device trademark registrations in other countries.

¹ The trademark registrations furnished by Complainant are in the name of Complainant, which is an affiliated entity of the Rexel Group. References to Complainant in this decision incorporate reference to the Rexel Group unless otherwise expressly indicated.

According to the Registrar's verification, Respondent is registrant of the disputed domain name. According to the Whois report, the disputed domain name was registered on January 31, 2026.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website headed "RX Rexel.ai", with the lead header "The intelligence layer for electrical distribution". There is a page on Respondent's website devoted to the promotion of "RexelGPT.ai". Respondent describes its RexelGPT.ai offering as: "Applied Intelligence for Industrial Supply Networks[,] RexelGPT.ai delivers product-data enrichment and catalogue intelligence across electrical, HVAC, tooling, and renewable sectors."² Respondent's website includes options for contacting Respondent, and information regarding various pricing plans. Pricing options range from GBP 99 to GBP 1,999 per month plus custom options (GBP 4000-12,000 per month). There is a disclaimer in small font at the bottom of Respondent's website stating "Independent Industry Resource: Rexel.ai is an independent platform for AI research in building, electrical, plumbing, and HVAC distribution. Not affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by Rexel Group".

Respondent has submitted evidence that its domain name was selected and website created using a GoDaddy website builder platform and through a series of chats Respondent engaged in with GoDaddy AI tools. The chat agent stated with respect to the term REXEL, "... I need to be 100% honest with you about how this looks from a legal standpoint. I am an AI, and I generated that specific five-word acronym sentence ('Rapid Extraction and X-Platform Enrichment Layer') during our chat". Respondent has stated, inter alia "The platform was developed collaboratively by a retired partner and her registered disabled son, neither of whom had prior programming experience. All wording, documentation, and development work was created using four free AI tools".

Complainant and Respondent differ regarding the extent to which Respondent's website associated with the disputed domain name is functioning as it is described. As part of its Supplemental Filing, Complainant has submitted a report prepared by a third-party consultant and cybersecurity firm that concludes "[xxx] Consulting identified that the website exhibits a consistent pattern of non-functional infrastructure across several interactive elements examined, consistent with a site built to simulate the appearance of a company rather than to operate as one." In its Supplemental Submission, Respondent disputes this characterization and attaches a website screenshot and several code file screenshots that it asserts demonstrate its website is functional.

Complainant queried Respondent's website chatbot (RexelGPT.ai) seeking information concerning Respondent's true identity (i.e., "what's your company and address?"). The chatbot responded stating: "I am RexelGPT, an AI assistant developed for Rexel.AI, which is part of the Rexel Group-a global leader in the distribution of electrical supplies and services. **Company:** Rexel Group [...]".

There is no evidence on the record of this proceeding of any association or affiliation, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it owns rights in the trademark REXEL and that the disputed domain name is identical to Complainant's trademark.

² The Panel's visit to "<https://rexel.ai/rexelgpt>" of September 21, 2026.

Complainant argues that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) REXEL is an arbitrary or fanciful mark and is not capable of use as a descriptive or generic term; (2) there is no evidence that Respondent was commonly known by the disputed domain name; (3) Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized Respondent to use its trademark; (4) Respondent has not made a good faith use of the disputed domain name, but has instead used it to mislead Internet users (whether or not prior to notice of a dispute), or for fair commercial or legitimate noncommercial purposes; (5) Respondent's claims to making legitimate commercial use of the disputed domain name are undermined by evidence that Respondent's website does not reliably perform the functions that it claims; (6) Respondent is operating in the exact fields of business as have been occupied by Complainant, and; (7) Respondent's claim that its disputed domain name was generated by an AI agent does not act to absolve it from responsibility for using a term identical to Complainant's trademark.

Complainant contends that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith because: (1) Respondent knew or should have known of Complainant's trademark rights when it registered the disputed domain name; (2) Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name; (3) Respondent specifically chose the disputed domain name because it is identical to Complainant's trademark and in order to commercially benefit from Complainant's reputation and goodwill in the electrical supplies distribution sector; (4) the disputed domain name directs Internet users to a website which offers for commercial gain an AI based solution that is operating in precisely the same field as Complainant and its AI offerings; (5) the disclaimer included on Respondent's website is not adequate to dispel Internet user confusion; (6) Respondent's website uses inaccurate or incomplete contact data; (7) Respondent included inaccurate data in its registration of the disputed domain name, and; (8) Respondent's filing of a trademark registration application for RX at the UKIPO has no bearing on this proceeding.

Complainant requests the Panel to direct the Registrar to transfer the disputed domain name to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Respondent concedes that the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark in which Complainant owns rights.

Respondent contends that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) it had designed, deployed and launched a functioning business-to-business platform at the disputed domain name prior to any notice of this dispute; (2) Respondent's AI engine is a multi-sector data-extraction and enrichment system covering, or being developed to cover, mechanical and electrical products, plumbing, structural building and construction, HVAC, renewable energy, and industrial tooling, whose functionality is outside of areas in which Complainant operates; (3) The term "rexel" is a technical acronym created internally during early development from "Rapid Extraction X-Platform Enrichment Layer" (REXEL); (4) Respondent's website was developed using free AI tools by individuals neither of whom had programming experience; (5) Respondent's partner filed a UK trademark application for the RX figurative logo representing Respondent's extraction engine, which was published in April 2026 and was not opposed by Complainant, and; (6) Respondent developed and deployed its RexelGPT.ai platform prior to notice of this dispute.

Respondent asserts that it has not registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith because: (1) it had no knowledge of Complainant or its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name, and did not intend to target Complainant in its selection of the disputed domain name; (2) the name “REXEL” was independently selected through an AI-assisted or algorithmic acronym-generation process before Respondent became aware of the dispute; (3) the industries in which Complainant and Respondent are operating are unrelated (citing *Rexel Développement SAS v. Akin Odedina, Afric Weddings*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0596](#)); (4) Respondent’s partner’s trademark application at the UKIPO for the RX figurative logo was published months before the Complaint was filed, and was not opposed by Complainant, confirming that Respondent was not targeting Complainant; (5) “GPT” is an acronym for “Generative Pre-trained Transformer” generically used in the AI industry; (6) Respondent’s website does not mimic Complainant’s branding or impersonate Complainant; (7) a response by Respondent’s website chatbot to an identity query from Complainant returning results with Complainant’s identity and contact information was an Large Language Model (“LLM”) hallucination providing results from the Internet, rather than a hardcoded instruction or an intentional attempt to impersonate Complainant, and; (8) the placeholder contact details in the registration records were temporary development-stage privacy measures, while Respondent maintained an operational email address for communications.

Respondent requests the Panel to reject the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three elements that must be established by a complainant to merit a finding that a respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use and to obtain relief.

These elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights;
- (ii) respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 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.

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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name has incorporated the entirety of the mark. Respondent has conceded that the disputed domain name is identical to Complainant’s REXEL trademark for purposes of the Policy.

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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant, as here, makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent, as here, fails to come forward with persuasive evidence to rebut Complainant’s prima facie case, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Respondent has asserted rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name based on its claim that it registered and began using the disputed domain name in connection with a commercial website prior to notice of a dispute with Complainant. Respondent has not adequately addressed whether its use is in connection with a “bona fide offering of goods or service”. As Complainant has pointed out, the services offered by Respondent on its website are very similar to those offered by Complainant. Complainant offers a wide range of services directed toward the electrical equipment sector, describing itself, inter alia: “We work with best-in-class suppliers to offer a comprehensive range of electrical supplies and solutions, including industrial control, automation and specialty products. Worldwide, our team of experts have the experience and know-how to help solve the challenges faced by different sectors. In addition to advice and training on products and services, we provide expertise in procurement, inventory management, maintenance and logistics for new products and replacement parts. Our aim is to help our industrial customers boost their efficiency, improve uptime and reach their sustainability goals.”³ Respondent describes its business, inter alia: “The industry’s open intelligence archive. Rexel.ai maintains the most comprehensive publicly accessible library of building, electrical, plumbing, and HVAC standards, regulations, compliance guides, and technical references in the UK market. ... Because an industry that shares knowledge moves faster than one that hoards it. ... Electrical and plumbing distribution is entering a data-first era. The platforms that build on clean, structured, enriched intelligence will define the next decade of the industry.” On its website, Respondent operates a platform identified as “RexelGPT.ai”. Respondent’s website describes RexelGPT.ai as “Applied Intelligence for Industrial Supply Networks. RexelGPT.ai delivers product-data enrichment and catalogue intelligence across electrical, HVAC, tooling, and renewable sectors”.

The parties differ over whether Respondent’s website is functional or a “sham”. Complainant has submitted a detailed report from a cybersecurity consulting firm concluding that Respondent’s website is effectively nonfunctional. Respondent has submitted screenshots of webpages and code that it says demonstrate that its website is functional, but the Panel notes that Respondent disclaims expertise in website building and coding. Ultimately, whether Respondent’s website is functional or nonfunctional is not material to the Panel’s determination regarding rights or legitimate interests because the Panel has decided that the services Respondent purports to offer

³ Panel’s visit to “www.rexel.com/en/what-we-do/industrial” (September 18, 2026).

are in the same field as those in which Complainant operates under its mark and that it is not making a bona fide offering of services. In summary, Respondent would not be in a better position if its website were fully functional because it has impermissibly adopted Complainant's trademark for its identity, using that identifier in offering its services in the same line of business as Complainant. This is not a bona fide offering from the standpoint of establishing rights or legitimate interests.

Respondent has relied on a prior UDRP decision, *Rexel Developpement SAS v. Akin Odedina, Afric Weddings*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0596](#), to assert that because it is operating in a different business sector than Complainant it is making a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to notice of the dispute. However, in the referenced case, the respondent was operating in the field of cybersecurity and had an established presence in that sector prior to a dispute with Complainant in this proceeding. The panel in *Rexel Developpement SAS v. Akin Odedina, Afric Weddings*, supra, relied on the separation between the businesses of the respondent in that proceeding, and the panel concluded that the respondent had not sought to create a false association with the complainant. There is no such separation between the fields of business in which Complainant and Respondent in this dispute are operating. By Respondent's own description, Respondent's platform is directed to the electrical, building, plumbing, HVAC, renewable-energy, and industrial sectors in which Complainant operates. They are both providing information and services in the field of electrical equipment and related distribution, thereby targeting substantially the same commercial ecosystem.

Respondent suggests that it did not target Complainant because the disputed domain name was selected by an algorithm that created an acronym from "Rapid Extraction X-Platform Enrichment Layer". Respondent's reliance on an algorithmic process does not affect the rights or legitimate interests analysis. Whether the Second-Level Domain "rexel" in the disputed domain name was selected by an algorithm or by a random selection of letters, Respondent chose to adopt Complainant's registered and long-used trademark to identify its website and business.

As discussed in the following section, the Panel is not persuaded that Respondent was unaware of Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name, and that in any case it should have known of Complainant and its trademark. More to the point on rights or legitimate interests, the Panel considers it implausible that Respondent might have developed and deployed its website without becoming aware of Complainant that maintains a substantial Internet presence under the same name. Respondent included a small-font disclaimer against association with Complainant.

Respondent's use of Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name does not constitute fair commercial use given the extensive presence of Complainant's trademark on Respondent's website to identify similar goods and services. There is no indication that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or Complainant's trademark prior to its registration of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and the Panel finds that Complainant has established that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 Respondent has asserted that the disputed domain name was selected by an algorithm for its “acronymic technical meaning”. However, Respondent, and not its AI tool, bears legal responsibility for selection and registration of the disputed domain name. Complainant’s trademark has been registered at the EUIPO and at the UKIPO since 2009, and Complainant is a major international presence in the distribution of electrical equipment. The services promoted on Respondent’s website at the disputed domain name target substantially the same commercial ecosystem as Complainant. A basic Internet search of Complainant’s trademark term registered by Respondent in the disputed domain name would have readily revealed Complainant and its trademark. Although not determinative, Respondent’s own evidence of an exchange with its AI tool suggests that Respondent was aware of a legal issue in connection with the disputed domain name.⁴ Respondent proceeded to disclaim affiliation with Complainant on its website. Under these circumstances, the Panel is not persuaded that Respondent did not have knowledge of Complainant’s trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. In any case, Respondent should have known of Complainant and its trademark at that time.

The Panel does not consider Respondent’s partner’s filing of an application for trademark registration for the term RX at the UKIPO relevant to this proceeding, nor does it consider Complainant’s failure to object to that registration relevant.

Despite the trappings of “technical complexity”, this case involves Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name that is identical to Complainant’s distinctive and long-used trademark in the same and substantially similar fields as those in which Complainant operates. There is a manifest likelihood of confusion among Internet users regarding Complainant’s association with Respondent and its website identified by the disputed domain name. The Panel determines that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant and its trademark as the source, sponsor, affiliate or endorser of Respondent’s website.

In light of the extensive adoption by Respondent of Complainant’s trademark throughout its website, the small font disclaimer on Respondent’s website does not cure the likelihood of confusion with Complainant and its trademark.

Respondent’s website chatbot responded to a query from Complainant regarding the company and its address by indicating that it was part of the Rexel Group. Respondent sought to dismiss the relevance of this by stating that the response was a classic example of an AI “hallucination”, and not a hardcoded system instruction. Whether the output of Respondent’s chatbot was a “hallucination” or hardcoded, the fact that the Respondent’s AI associated the website with the “Rexel Group” (i.e., Complainant) constitutes supporting evidence of a likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and Complainant’s trademark and business.

Respondent appears to have relied almost entirely on a GoDaddy website builder and AI tools to create its domain name and platform on the website. Given the circumstances, the Panel considers there to be a significant likelihood that the documents submitted by Respondent in this proceeding were likewise created by, or substantially with the assistance of, that AI system. Respondent is nonetheless responsible for its content and conduct. Use of an AI is not a defense to abusive domain name registration and use.

⁴ See Factual Background, *supra*. Respondent provided the text of a chat with its AI tool regarding its proposed domain name which started with Respondent stating: “But it was you that came up with it”, and the AI tool responding “You are completely right, and I need to be 100% honest with you about how this looks from a legal standpoint. I am an AI, and I generated that specific five-word acronyms sentence (‘Rapid Extraction and X-Platform Enrichment Layer’) during our chat.” Respondent’s Annex D-2. This conversation extract implies that Respondent was aware of a legal issue with respect to the selection of the disputed domain name. Because of limits in the surrounding context, this evidence is not in itself determinative.

The Panel determines that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <rexel.ai> be transferred to Complainant.

/Frederick M. Abbott/

Frederick M. Abbott

Sole Panelist

Date: October 8, 2026