

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Pluxee International v. Yiwei Ren

Case No. D2025-4166

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Pluxee International, France, represented by Areopage, France.

The Respondent is Yiwei Ren, China.

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

The disputed domain name <pluxeegroup.site> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 10, 2025. On October 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 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 (“APINAME” “APINAME Ltd”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 16, 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 October 20, 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 October 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Manuel Wegrostek as the sole panelist in this matter on November 20, 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 part of the Sodexo Group. In 2023, the Sodexo business relating to employee benefits and engagement solutions which was operated by Sodexo Pass International, changed its name into Pluxee.

The Complainant is internationally well known as it is one of the world's leaders in the employee benefits market, ranging from meal, food, and gift to mobility benefits and rewards and recognition and engagement programs, as well as public benefits. The PLUXEE trademark is used in connection with employee benefits services, incentives and recognition services, public benefits services, fuel & fleet and expense management services.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for PLUXEE INTERNATIONAL ("PLUXEE Trademark"), including:

- International Trademark Registration PLUXEE No. 1706936, registered on November 2, 2022, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 42 and 43
- French Trademark Registration No. 224905284, registered on October 14, 2022, in classes 9, 16, 35, 3, 42 and 43

The Complainant is also owner of various domain names including the PLUXEE Trademark, such as the domain name <pluxeegroup.com>.

The disputed domain name was created on September 22, 2025. The Complainant provided evidence that at the time the amended Complaint was filed, this disputed domain name resolved to an active website on "godaddy.com" on which the disputed domain name was displayed as being for sale for USD 1,450. At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website, rather to an error notice.

#### **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.

On the first element of the Policy, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the PLUXEE Trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known PLUXEE Trademark in its entirety. In the disputed domain name, the PLUXEE Trademark is followed by the generic word "group". The addition of the generic word "group" refers to an affiliation with PLUXEE. Therefore, the addition of the generic word "group" is not sufficient to dispel the similarity between the PLUXEE Trademark and the disputed domain name on the contrary the expression "Pluxee Group" could therefore refer to the Complainant's official website. The disputed domain name led to an active website on which users could buy the disputed domain name.

On the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is registered in the name of Yiwei Ren. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor is he affiliated with the

Complainant in any way. The Respondent does not have any affiliation, association, sponsorship or connection with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to make any use of its PLUXEE Trademark, in a domain name, in shop sign, in the use of its logos on the website, or otherwise. There is no evidence that suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant has recently faced attacks by phishing with domain names incorporating the PLUXEE Trademark. The Complainant states that it has good reason to believe that it could be a victim of phishing with the disputed domain name.

On the third element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The PLUXEE Trademark is purely fanciful, and nobody could legitimately choose this word or any variation thereof especially associated with the word “group” unless seeking to be in association with the Complainant’s activities and the PLUXEE Trademark. It is therefore inconceivable for the Respondent to argue that they were not aware of the Complainant’s trademark when they registered the disputed domain name in 2025. The website which the disputed domain name resolved gave users the chance to buy the disputed domain name for 1,450 USD. Finally, bad faith use may also result from the threat of an abusive use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent (for instance, for phishing).

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires that the Panel’s decision be made “on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

It has been a consensus view in previous UDRP decisions that a respondent’s default (i.e., failure to submit a response) would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent’s default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant’s claims are true (see section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”)).

The Complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the Complaint with respect to each disputed domain name, namely that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 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 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 applicable TLD in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain name contains the PLUXEE Trademark in its entirety with the only addition of the word “group”. The Panel finds the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise), in this case “group”, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the 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 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.

UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s distinctive PLUXEE Trademark with the word “group” (being nearly identical to the Complainant’s domain name <pluxeegroup.com>), carries a risk of implied affiliation or association.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain names or to use the PLUXEE Trademark. The Panel finds that there are no indications on record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or otherwise has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name is not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name redirected to an active website offering users the chance to buy the disputed domain name, that includes the PLUXEE Trademark in its entirety, for 1,450 USD.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds 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 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.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

Panels have moreover 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: (i) actual confusion, (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (iii) the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer, (v) redirecting the domain name to the complainant's (or a competitor's) website, and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, 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, the disputed domain name incorporates the PLUXEE Trademark in its entirety and this trademark was registered years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Considering the distinctiveness and reputation of the well-known PLUXEE Trademark, Internet users may think the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant and would resolve to a website related to the Complainant because the addition of the term "group" suggests an affiliation or associate with the Complainant, noting e.g., the Complainant's official website "pluxeegroup.com". Further, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name, at the time of filing the Complaint, resolved to an active website where the disputed domain name was offered for sale for 1,450 USD. This price is for valuable consideration purportedly in excess of out of pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily to sell it to the Complainant (or its competitor) for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's costs related to the domain name and intentionally tried to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its PLUXEE Trademark. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <pluxeegroup.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Manuel Wegrostek/*

**Manuel Wegrostek**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 4, 2025