

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Widdy Nugraha, 1trade.io
Case No. D2025-0770

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sodexo, France, represented by Areopage, France.

The Respondent is Widdy Nugraha, 1trade.io, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexoo.info> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 25, 2025. On February 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 26, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 28, 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 March 3, 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 March 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Roger Staub as the sole panelist in this matter on April 4, 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 SODEXO, a French limited company. The Complainant submits that it was founded in 1966 and that it is one of the largest companies in the world specialized in food services and facilities management. According to the Complainant's website at <sodexo.com>, it has 423,000 employees serving 80 million consumers in 45 countries. The Complainant further submits that, for the fiscal year 2024, its consolidated revenues reached EUR 23.8 billion. It is listed as one of "The world's Most Admired Companies" by FORTUNE Magazine. The Complainant's group is also established in Indonesia where the Respondent is located.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations consisting of, or containing, the term "sodexo". The Complainant's portfolio of SODEXO trademark registrations includes, inter alia, the following trademark registrations:

- European Union trademark No. 006104657 SODEXO, registered on June 27, 2008, in Classes 09, 16, and 35-45;
- International trademark No. 964615 SODEXO, registered on January 8, 2008, in Classes 09, 16, and 35-45, covering, inter alia, Australia, China, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Switzerland, and the United States of America;
- Indonesian trademark No. IDM000237977 SODEXO, registered on September 2, 2020, in Classes 09 and 16.

The Complainant and its group companies promote their activities, inter alia, under the following domain names: <sodexo.com>, <uk.sodexo.com>, <sodexoprestige.co.uk>, <sodexo.fr>, <sodexoca.com>, <sodexousa.com>, <cn.sodexo.com>, <sodexho.fr>, and <sodexho.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 22, 2025, and is inactive.

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 submits the following arguments:

First, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the marks SODEXO and SODEXHO, in which the Complainant has rights. It is composed of the identical sign SODEXO, with the addition of one more letter "o" at the end. The addition of the letter "o" is inoperative to distinguish the disputed domain name from the SODEXO mark, as the SODEXO mark is still dominant and keeps its individuality and attractive character in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name corresponds to a typosquatting practice.

Second, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not known to the Complainant. It has no rights in SODEXO as corporate name, trade name, shop sign, mark, or domain name that would be prior to the Complainant's rights. The Respondent was not

commonly known by the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Respondent does not have any affiliation, association, sponsorship, or connection with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant or by any subsidiary or affiliated company of the Complainant to register and use the disputed domain name.

Third, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The sign SODEXO is purely fanciful and nobody could legitimately choose this word or any variation thereof, unless seeking to create an association with the Complainant's activities and trademark. Given the well-known character and reputation of the SODEXO mark, the Respondent obviously knew of its existence when it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent wants to benefit from the Complainant's mark and its reputation. Even if the disputed domain name, which has been recently created, does not presently have any active content, a passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The Complainant submits that it has recently faced several attacks, and that it strongly fears a fraudulent use of the disputed domain name (however, the Panel notes that the Complainant does not submit that the attacks were made by using the disputed domain name).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to the Policy, to qualify for a cancellation or transfer of the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

First, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark to which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Third, the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Since the Respondent did not submit a Response, the Panel may choose to accept the reasonable contentions of the Complainant as true. This Panel will determine whether those facts meet the requirements of the Policy that is sufficient to order the transfer of the disputed domain name (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#)).

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The mere addition of the letter "o" to the mark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The disputed domain name could readily be typed by mistake instead of a domain name identical to this mark apart from the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") suffix or misread as that domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 that 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 credibly submits that it has never authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to use the disputed domain name incorporating its well-reputed SODEXO mark. Additionally, typosquatting is evidence of a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, see *Redbox Automated Retail, LLC d/b/a Redbox v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1600](#).

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that typosquatting, such as the addition of a letter, is evidence that the Respondent was aware of and sought to impersonate the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Redbox Automated Retail, LLC d/b/a Redbox v. Milen Radumilo*, supra. As such, typosquatting is evidence of bad faith registration of a domain name. See, *Longs Drug Stores California, Inc. v. Shep Dog*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-1069](#). This finding is further supported by the Complainant’s reputation and by the fact that the Complainant is also doing business in the Respondent’s country of residence Indonesia. This suggests that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark, when it registered the disputed domain name. In addition, it appears that the Respondent has sought to conceal its identity by

using a privacy service. 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 <sodexoo.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Roger Staub/

Roger Staub

Sole Panelist

Date: April 18, 2025