

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Lane Hunerd, SodexoHr
Case No. D2026-0085

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Lane Hunerd, SodexoHr, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexohr.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 9, 2026. On January 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On January 9, 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 (PERFECT PRIVACY, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 13, 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 January 14, 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 January 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuzo Wada as the sole panelist in this matter on February 18, 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, Sodexo (formerly Sodexho Alliance), is a French company founded in 1966, specializing in food services and facilities management and has marketed the SODEXO mark and tradename globally. In 2008, the company simplified the spelling of its mark and name from SODEXHO to SODEXO.

The Complainant owns the trademarks SODEXO, covering services in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, which were registered in numerous jurisdictions including the following:

- SODEXO (figurative), International Trademark Registration No. 964615, registered on January 8, 2008, and protected in numerous jurisdictions including the United States of America;
- SODEXO (word), International Trademark Registration No. 1240316, registered on October 23, 2014; and
- SODEXO (word), European Union trademark registration No. 008346462, registered on February 1, 2010.

As such, the SODEXO marks are registered in many other countries of the world including the United States of America, where the Respondent is located.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 23, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a parking webpage containing pay-per-click ("PPC") links, including some referencing the Complainant.

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 that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's SODEXO trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks any rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain a decision that a domain name should be either cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 ("[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 Panel finds that the Complainant has rights in the registered mark SODEXO. The Panel further finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to this mark, since the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's trademark. The mere addition of the term "hr", an abbreviation for "human resources", along with the generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com" to the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent may establish a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name by demonstrating any of the following non-exhaustive circumstances listed in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy:

- (a) that the Respondent has used, or made preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to any notice of the dispute; or
- (b) that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (c) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant's trademark registrations for SODEXO predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise consented to the Respondent's use of the trademarks in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. From the evidence in the case record, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a parking webpage containing PPC links, some of which referenced the Complainant.

In these circumstances, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant having established a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests. Although the Respondent uses the name of the Respondent organization, "SodexoHr", as part of the Disputed Domain Name, it has not submitted any response in this regard nor is there any evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is actually commonly known as

“SodexoHr”. Rather, it appears most likely that such details were specifically chosen to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. There is likewise no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “Sodexo”, which term is purely imaginative and therefore highly distinctive.

Despite having been given the opportunity to do so, the Respondent has not submitted any evidence in this case to demonstrate that it owns any trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name.

Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant’s submissions, and the Panel concludes that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be evidence of the registration and use in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or has acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or

(ii) the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding Disputed Domain Name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered after the Complainant first acquired rights in the SODEXO trademark. Without the authorization from the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a parking website containing PPC links, including those referencing the Complainant.

The Panel accepts the Complainant’s contention that the Complainant’s trademark SODEXO is well known. The incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by a registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith (*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#); and *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#)).

The Panel finds that Internet users are likely to be misled by the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant’s trademark into supposing that the Disputed Domain Name indicates a site belonging to, or authorized by, the Complainant. The only rational reason for using such a domain name would be to attract some of the Complainant’s customers to the Respondent’s site. This falls squarely within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy (*Inter Ikea Systems B.V. v. Daniel Woodson*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1933](#)).

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website that displayed PPC links, including those referencing the Complainant. Visitors to the Respondent's website may be confused that there is some kind of relationship or endorsement by the Complainant of the PPC links displayed there.

This leads the Panel to the conclusion that by registering and using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the endorsement by the Complainant of the Respondent's website. This supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Noting that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates a well-known trademark, that no response has been filed, and the Respondent's use of the Complainant's company name in the registration details of the Disputed Domain Name, and in light of these considerations and all the facts and evidence, the Panel therefore finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy are also fulfilled in this case.

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 <sodexohr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuzo Wada/

Yuzo Wada

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026