

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sopra Steria Group v. XIAOWEI XIE
Case No. D2026-1593

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sopra Steria Group, France, represented by FIDAL, France.

The Respondent is XIAOWEI XIE, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <soprasteria.vip> 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 April 15, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 17, 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 (No information provided) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 20, 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 April 24, 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 April 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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 Sopra Steria Group, a French company. The record indicates that the Complainant's corporate registration traces back to January 25, 1968.

The Complainant operates in the field of information technology services, including IT consulting, digital services, software development, systems integration, artificial intelligence, and related technology services. The record also shows that the Complainant maintains a structured online presence in English and French.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations:

SOPRA STERIA (figurative) – France – registration number 4125228 – registered on April 3, 2015;

SOPRA STERIA (figurative) – European Union – registration number 013623889 – registered on May 15, 2015; and

SOPRA STERIA (figurative) – International – registration number 1290669 – registered on September 24, 2015.

The Complainant also owns domain names incorporating the SOPRA STERIA mark, including <soprasteria.com>, registered on April 7, 2014, and <soprasteria.fr>, registered on April 15, 2014, which are used for the Complainant's official online activities.

The disputed domain name is <soprasteria.vip>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 13, 2026.

The record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to an active website displaying the SOPRA STERIA sign and a logo closely corresponding to the Complainant's branding. The website reproduced or closely imitated the Complainant's official websites in its layout, imagery, navigation headings, and content relating to the Complainant's technology services and corporate activities.

The Respondent appears to be an individual located in the United States of America. No further information regarding the Respondent is available from the record.

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SOPRA STERIA mark because it reproduces that mark in its entirety, the only differences being the removal of the space between the words and the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".vip". The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not authorised to use the Complainant's mark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has used the disputed domain name for a website imitating the Complainant's official websites rather than for any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith, asserting that the Respondent necessarily had the Complainant and its mark in mind, given the composition of the disputed domain name and the use of the associated website to reproduce the Complainant's branding, layout, images, and textual content, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

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 the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is almost identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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 Complainant states that it has not authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the SOPRA STERIA mark, whether in the disputed domain name or otherwise. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark without any additional differentiating element beyond the Top-Level Domain. In the circumstances of this case, such composition carries a clear risk of implied affiliation and does not support any claim to fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The use of the disputed domain name reinforces that conclusion. The record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the SOPRA STERIA sign and a logo closely corresponding to the Complainant's branding, while presenting content, imagery, layout, and navigation elements that appeared to reproduce or closely imitate the Complainant's official websites.

Such use is not consistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed copycat site, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant had obtained registered trademark rights in SOPRA STERIA and long after the Complainant had registered and used domain names incorporating that mark, including <soprasteria.com> and <soprasteria.fr>.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's SOPRA STERIA mark in its entirety, with no element capable of distinguishing it from the Complainant's mark other than the Top-Level Domain. The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name, taken together with the Complainant's prior trademark rights and online presence, supports an inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

That inference is strongly reinforced by the use made of the disputed domain name. The associated website displayed the SOPRA STERIA sign and a logo closely corresponding to the Complainant's branding. It also reproduced or closely imitated substantial elements of the Complainant's official websites, including visual presentation, navigation categories, textual content, images, and references to the Complainant's business activities. The Panel finds it implausible that such use could have arisen independently or by coincidence.

The circumstances of the case therefore point to deliberate targeting of the Complainant. By using the disputed domain name for a website presented in a manner suggesting that it was operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant, the Respondent created a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed copycat site, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. 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 name <soprasteria.vip> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: June 19, 2026