

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Myron Shuvalov

Case No. D2025-3697

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Myron Shuvalov, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sobexo.site> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 11, 2025. On September 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 15, 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 (Unknown / Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 15, 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 September 18, 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 September 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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 a company registered in France. It is a provider of food services and facilities management.

The Complainant has traded under the name and mark SODEXO since 2008. It is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark SODEXO, including for example:

- International Trademark Registration number 964615 for a figurative mark SODEXO, registered on January 8, 2008, in numerous International Classes; and
- European Union trademark registration number 008346462 for the word mark SODEXO, registered on February 1, 2010, in numerous International Classes.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.sodexo.com”.

The Complainant’s SODEXO trademark has been recognized by previous panels under the UDRP as having obtained the status of a well-known trademark (see e.g. *Sodexo v. Domains By Proxy, LLC*, *DomainsByProxy.com / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3085](#)).

The disputed domain name was registered on September 2, 2025.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a Spanish-language website headed “Bexo Super Soft”, which appears to promote a casino and gaming app.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that it is one of the world’s largest companies in the food services and facilities management sector, with 423,000 employees serving 80 million consumers daily in 45 countries. It claims consolidated revenues of EUR 23.8 billion for its 2024 fiscal year.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its SODEXO trademark, the only difference being that the letter “d” in the trademark is replaced by the letter “b” in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has never authorized or permitted the Respondent to use its SODEXO trademark, and that the Respondent has not commonly been known by any name corresponding to the disputed domain name. It further submits that the disputed domain name does not match the name of the product supposedly offered on the Respondent’s website.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. It contends that, owing to the well-known status of its SODEXO trademark, which is fanciful name, it should be inferred that the Respondent was aware of that trademark and registered the disputed domain name in order to take unfair advantage of it. Specifically, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, prospective customers to its website by creating a

likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's name and mark and by misleading them into believing that its own products are proposed, authorized or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant further asserts that the possibility "cannot be excluded" that the website linked to the disputed domain name contains malware, or is a basis for phishing attacks. (The Panel notes, however, that the Complainant exhibits no actual evidence in support of these assertions.)

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue – Location of the Respondent

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the administrative proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that they should.

The record shows that Notification of Complaint email was sent to the Respondent's email address disclosed by the Registrar and an email address appearing on the website at the disputed domain name. It was not delivered at both above email addresses, as the email server returned error messages stating that the recipient was unknown and "[t]he email account that you tried to reach does not exist", respectively. Postal notification is reported to have failed, but the Panel notes that the address appears to be incomplete, as it only includes a city and a street name without a house number.

Further, a Whois contact form sent to the registrant of the disputed domain name shows that the notification has been sent successfully.

The Panel considers that the Center employed all reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent, including the Respondent's email and postal addresses as confirmed by the Registrar, the email address available on the website at the disputed domain name, the postmaster address as required by the Rules, and the Whois contact form. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered as recently as September 2, 2025.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel does not find the Respondent's website to represent any genuine commercial venture, and finds that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in order to target the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent, who is allegedly located in Ukraine, has been given a fair opportunity to present its case and, noting that the administrative proceedings should proceed with due expedition, will proceed to a decision accordingly.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights for the mark SODEXO. The disputed domain name differs from that trademark only by the substitution of the letter “b” in the disputed domain name for the letter “d” in the trademark. Therefore, on a straightforward side-by-side comparison, the disputed domain name is, both visually and aurally, highly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.¹

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In view of its having failed to respond to the Complainant’s contentions, the Respondent has provided no indication of its reason for registering the disputed domain name, or of any rights or legitimate interests that it may claim to have in the disputed domain name, whether in the circumstances contemplated by paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise.

While the website linked to the disputed domain name appears to promote a casino and gaming app named “Bexo Super Soft”, the Complainant is correct in its contention that the disputed domain name does not reflect that name. Nor is there any explanation for the Respondent’s prefixing of the term “bexo” with the letters “so” in the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, a straightforward Google search against the term “bexo super soft” does not appear to return any results corresponding with the Respondent’s supposed offering.²

The Panel does not therefore find the Respondent’s website to represent any bona fide offering of goods or services, and infers in all the circumstances that the disputed domain name was more likely registered with the intention of targeting the Complainant’s rights in its well-known trademark SODEXO.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the case of a famous or well-known trademark, the registration of a highly similar domain name may, in appropriate cases, give rise to an inference of “opportunistic bad faith” on the part of the respondent. In this instance, given the well-known status of the Complainant’s SODEXO trademark, the lack of any evidence that the Respondent’s website offering is genuine, or of any explanation for the prefixing of the name “bexo” with the letters “so” in the disputed domain name, the Panel infers on balance that the disputed domain name was both registered and has been used in bad faith, namely, for the purpose of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark rights.

Specifically, the Panel concludes that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

¹ See e.g. section 1.7 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)).

² As observed in section 4.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.

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 <sobexo.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: October 24, 2025