ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Pluxee International v. Weijie Xu
Case No. DME2026-0011

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Weijie Xu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pluxeegroup.me> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 9, 2026. On September 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 10, 2026, 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 September 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 14, 2026.

The Center appointed R. Eric Gaum as the sole panelist in this matter on October 21, 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 owns the following registered marks PLUXEE in the name of Pluxee International:

PLUXEE, International trademark registration n° 1706936, registered on November 2, 2022, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 42 and 43, to designate the following jurisdictions: Austria, Bulgaria, Brazil, Benelux, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Czech Republic, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, Indonesia, Israel, India, Italy, Morocco, Mexico, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United States of America, Viet Nam, European Union;

PLUXEE, French trademark registration n° 4905284, filed on October 14, 2022, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 42 and 43;

PLUXEE, French trademark registration n° 5159822, filed on June 27, 2025, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.

PLUXEE, International trademark registration n° 1901238, registered on October 22, 2025, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, to designate the following jurisdictions: Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, European Union, United Kingdom, Indonesia, Israel, India, Jersey, Morocco, Mexico, Philippines, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United States of America.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 25, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a GoDaddy website where the disputed domain name is listed as for sale for USD 1,450.

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 following:

The SODEXO Group is one of the largest companies in the world specialized in foodservices, facilities management and earlier, in benefit and reward services, with more than 426 000 employees serving daily 80 million consumers in 43 countries.

In 2023, Sodexo business relating to employee benefits and engagement solutions, which was operated by SODEXO PASS INTERNATIONAL, changed its name into PLUXEE.

On February 1, 2024, the Pluxee group was spun-off from Sodexo.

Pluxee is listed on Euronext Paris following its spin-off from Sodexo.

These activities relating to employee benefits and engagement solutions were developed in France in 1976.

During the years, the Complainant expanded its activity all over the world and acquired key companies to strengthen its status as a global leader in employee engagement and recognition.
The PLUXEE group 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.

For fiscal year 2025, consolidated revenues reached 1,287 million euros.

The PLUXEE group delivers over 250 products to 37 million consumers through 500,000 clients connected to 1.7 million affiliated merchants in 28 countries.

The disputed domain name <pluxeegroup.me> incorporates the PLUXEE mark in its entirety with the addition of the element “group”.

The addition of the generic word “group” clearly refers to an affiliation with PLUXEE.

The expression “PLUXEE GROUP” therefore refers to a Pluxee’s official website.

The addition of the word “group” in the disputed domain name is inoperative to distinguish it from the Complainant’s marks as in the disputed domain name <pluxeegroup.me>, the PLUXEE mark is dominant and keeps its individuality and attractive character.

The sign PLUXEE is purely fanciful and nobody could legitimately choose this word or any variation thereof (especially associated with the term “group”), unless seeking to create an association with the Complainant’s activities and mark PLUXEE.

The Respondent obviously knew the existence of the PLUXEE mark when he registered the disputed domain name <pluxeegroup.me>, so that he perfectly knew that he had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that he cannot lawfully use it.

Due to the identical reproduction of the PLUXEE mark, the public will obviously believe that the disputed domain name <pluxeegroup.me> comes from the Complainant or is linked to the Complainant. The confusion is more likely that the Complainant is the owner of the domain name <pluxeegroup.com>, and uses it to connect to its official website.

The disputed domain name <pluxeegroup.me> resolves to a page on Godaddy.com, where the disputed domain name is listed as being for sale for USD 1,450.

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 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 bear on the 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 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 Complainant has alleged that PLUXEE is purely fanciful and nobody could legitimately choose this word or any variation thereof (especially associated with the term "group"), unless seeking to create an association with the Complainant's activities and mark PLUXEE. The Panel further notes that the Complainant uses the domain name <pluxeegroup.com> for its official website. In these circumstances, and taking into account the distinctive nature of the PLUXEE mark, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant and its PLUXEE mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

.

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 disputed domain name resolves to a webpage on which it is offered for sale for USD 1,450. In the circumstances of this case, including the composition of the disputed domain name and the absence of any apparent rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent's part, the Panel finds that the offer for sale supports the conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/R. Eric Gaum/
R. Eric Gaum
Sole Panelist
Date: November 4, 2026