

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PLUXEE INTERNATIONAL v. Ibrahim Mueller
Case No. D2025-5122

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PLUXEE INTERNATIONAL, France, represented by AREOPAGE, France.

The Respondent is Ibrahim Mueller, Austria, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <plu-xee.top> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 9, 2025. On December 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 11, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 December 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on December 15 and 19, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, formerly part of the Sodexo Group, has, since 2023, offered employee benefits services under its PLUXEE mark. It delivers over 250 products to 37 million consumers in 28 countries.

The Complainant's mark is registered as International Trademark Registration No. 1706936 PLUXEE in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 42, and 43, having a registration date of November 2, 2022, designating Austria amongst others.

The Complainant's primary website is hosted at its domain name <pluxee-group.com>, which was registered on November 4, 2022. The Complainant has a presence in Austria and operates a website for its Austrian business from its domain name <pluxee.at>.

The Complainant's mark has been recognized as being well known by prior panels under the Policy. See, for e.g., *Pluxee International v. Yikai Ren*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2710](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 25, 2025, and currently redirects to an inactive page at another domain name registered by the Respondent, <pluxee.top>. The Complainant's evidence establishes that the disputed domain name previously redirected to a Registrar domain name marketplace page offering that domain name for sale for EUR 1 977 777,77. The Respondent indicated in its Response that the disputed domain name "was never for sale" but was intended to be included in the sale offer of the domain name <pluxee.top>.

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 was registered and has been used in bad faith for the purpose of selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs relating directly to the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. Insofar as the Panel is able to make out, the Respondent primarily claims that the disputed domain name is generic as it consists of three dictionary terms "plu", "xee", and "top", and that the disputed domain name is distinguishable from the Complainant's mark given the use of two distinct terms plus the addition of the ".top" Top-Level Domain ("TLD"). More specifically, the Respondent seems to argue that the term "plu" appears in Wiktionary with different meanings in various languages including in English as a symbol/abbreviation for "Palikur" (a tribal language spoken in French Guiana and Brazil), and the term "xee" features in Wiktionary as a verb in Galician and a pronoun ("I"/"me") in a South American language Myba Guarani. The Respondent adds that "no one needs to understand why certain words / characters from different languages got combined." It further states that the Complainant's website says that "plux" stands for positivity, the "x" symbolises the world of opportunities and "ee" represents "employee engagement" – which is clearly different to the way the Respondent uses the disputed domain name.

The Respondent also asserts that the Complaint has been filed in bad faith and requests that the Panel make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH").

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of a hyphen between components of the Complainant's mark within the disputed domain name does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity. See *VeriSign Inc. v. Bin g Glu / G Design*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0421](#). Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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 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.

As discussed further in relation to bad faith below, it is most likely that the Respondent's intentions were to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs. This cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1981](#).

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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name with an intention to sell it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs, falling within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely known trademark, as in this case, by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Respondent provided a disclaimer on the sale listing page for another domain name <pluxee.top>, to which the disputed domain name previously redirected, stating that the Respondent has no connection with “PLUXEE N.V.”, which is a company within the Complainant’s group. This, in the Panel’s view, if anything, shows prior knowledge of the Complainant’s mark. Furthermore, the Respondent itself does not dispute it was aware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant’s evidence establishes that the Respondent has registered other domain names that incorporate the Complainant’s mark or that of its previous group, the Sodexo Group, specifically <sodexo.top> and <pluxee.top>. Most notably, the Respondent has already been found to have targeted the Complainant in a case under the Policy concerning the domain name <pluxee.top> filed before the registration date of the disputed domain name. See *Pluxee International v. Ibrahim Mueller*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4395](#).

The Panel takes the view that it cannot have been a coincidence that the Respondent sought to register another domain name that is confusingly similar to the well-known trademark associated with the Complainant within a short space of time under the same TLD. This points to targeting of the Complainant in the present case.

Turning to the Respondent’s claim that the disputed domain name is generic, the fact that the components “plu” and “xee” may be dictionary words in other, less commonly used languages, as advanced by the Respondent, does not assist the Respondent’s case. The Respondent has provided no explanation for why he chose these specific terms - which, as combined have no dictionary or conceptual meaning in any of those languages (see *SonarSource SA v. Hasan Kibar*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3938](#)) but represent the Complainant’s registered mark – when he does not live in any country where any of these languages appear to be used, and shows no prior affinity whatsoever with these languages. In the circumstances of this case, without any cogent explanation from the Respondent, the Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that the Respondent sought to target the Complainant’s mark.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel makes no finding of the RDNH.

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 <plu-xee.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: January 13, 2026