

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pluxee International v. Felipe Sanjurjo, Nova Tempo LLC
Case No. D2026-0463

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Felipe Sanjurjo, Nova Tempo LLC, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pluxeeigroup.live> is registered with Porkbun LLC and the disputed domain name <pluxeeigroup.space> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar” or the “Registrars” as appropriate in context).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 4, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf and Private by Design, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 5, 2026, 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 9, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 6, 2026.

The Center appointed James Bridgeman as the sole panelist in this matter on March 12, 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 is an international provider of in the employee benefits services, ranging from meal, food and gift to mobility benefits and rewards and recognition and engagement programs as well as public benefits.

The Complainant owns and uses the PLUXEE trademark and service mark for which it holds a large international portfolio of registrations including the following:

- International trademark PLUXEE, registration number 1706936, registered on November 2, 2022, for goods and services in classes 09, 16, 35, 36, 42, 43;
- French registered trademark PLUXEE, registration number 4905284, registered on March 10, 2023, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 42, 43; and
- French registered trademark PLUXEE (figurative), registration number 5159822 registered on November 7, 2025, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45.

The Complainant has an established Internet presence and maintains websites promoting its business and services including at “www.pluxee.co” to which Respondent has caused each of the disputed domain names resolve without the license of permission of the Complainant.

The disputed domain names were each registered on January 28, 2026, albeit with different Registrars. In each case the Respondent availed of a privacy service to conceal its identity on the published WhoIs.

There is no information available about the Respondent except for that provided in the Complaint, the WhoIs information for each of the disputed domain names, and the Registrar’s WhoIs, and the information provided by the Registrars in response to the request by the Center for details of the registration of the disputed domain names for the purposes of this proceeding.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, the Complainant contends that each of the disputed domain names is identical to its PLUXEE mark.

Furthermore, it is contended that the Respondent has no rights of legitimate interests in either of the disputed domain names, because the Respondent does not use either of the disputed domain names to make a bona fide or legitimate offering of goods or services or to making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Rather the Respondent has caused, permitted or allowed each of the disputed domain names to resolve to the Complainant’s own Colombian website at “www.pluxee.co”.

The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name which is identical to Complainant's mark was registered and is being used in bad faith; that the Respondent must have been actually aware of the Complainant when the disputed domain name was chosen and registered; and the Respondent's unauthorized use of the disputed name without license of authority to resolve to the Complainant's Colombian website is an interference with, and diversion of the flow of Internet traffic intended for the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within each of the disputed domain names in combination with the descriptive element "group" in each case. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "group" may in each case bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

The record shows that the Respondent is using each of the disputed domain names to resolve to the Complainant's own website for the Colombian market at "www.pluxee.co" which is neither a bona fide or legitimate offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, Respondent is using each of the disputed domain names to misleadingly divert consumers and to tarnish the PLUXEE trademark and service mark at issue.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here intercepting and diverting Internet traffic intended for Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The screen capture exhibited in an annex to the Complaint shows that the Respondent is using both of the disputed domain names in an identical illegitimate manner, to resolve to the Complainant's official website in Colombia, without the license or authority of the Complainant.

The interception and diversion of Internet traffic bound for Complainant in such manner constitutes registration and use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) (iv) because the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. It may be inferred on the balance of probabilities that the Complainant is creating such diversions for commercial gain.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity as here, causing, permitting, or allowing each the disputed domain names to resolve to the Complainant's official website in Colombia, as shown in a screen capture exhibited in an annex to the Complaint constitutes bad faith.

The unsuspecting Internet user will not be aware that their traffic seeking the Complainant's website is being attracted, intercepted, and diverted.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4 states inter alia that "Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such active ("behind the scenes") uses are considered distinct from the passive holding doctrine discussed above, and can include a range of bad faith activity..."

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 names <pluxeegroup.live> and <pluxeegroup.space> be transferred to the Complainant.

/James Bridgeman/

James Bridgeman

Sole Panelist

Date: March 19, 2026