

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. ramsay sesta
Case No. D2026-0953

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is ramsay sesta, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 5, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 9, 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 March 12, 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 March 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on May 4, 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 French based Complainant, founded in 1966, is one of the world leading companies specialized in food services and facilities management (Annexes 4 and 5 to the Complaint).

The Complainant has registered numerous trademarks containing and/or consisting of the mark SODEXO, inter alia:

- European Union trademark registration for SODEXO (word), Reg. No. 008346462, registered on February 1, 2010 and
- International trademark registration for SODEXO (word), Reg. No. 1240316, registered October 23, 2014 (Annexes 6 – 13 to the Complaint).

Further, the Complainant owns and uses numerous domain names containing the mark SODEXO, e.g. <sodexo.com> or <sodexo.fr>; under the domain name <sodexo.com> the Complainant provides its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 27, 2026 (Annex 1 to the Complaint). At the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to a parking site, hosted with Hostinger (Annex 14 to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for cancellation of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the SODEXO trademark is highly distinctive, well known and famous around the world; it notes that the disputed domain name contains the SODEXO trademark in its entirety and simply adding a "x" to the mark SODEXO which cannot eliminate the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant's trademark registrations as well as domain name registrations which contain the SODEXO mark are prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that especially because of the fame of the Complainant and its trademark it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name, or that there would be any legitimate use for the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to use the SODEXO trademark in any manner.

Finally, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and is therefore not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services; moreover, the passive holding of a domain name which contains famous and well-known trademarks may amount to bad faith.

Further, the Complainant contends that it strongly fears fraudulent uses of the disputed domain name for phishing, especially to perpetrate an email scam sent to its clients requesting payment of false invoices on fake Sodexo bank accounts, to order products to Complainant's clients for considerable amounts by impersonating Complainant's employees, or to steal personal data.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed 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 Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the mark SODEXO for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark SODEXO in which the Complainant has rights since it incorporates the entirety of the mark and only adds the letter "x" to the SODEXO mark.

It has long been established under UDRP decisions that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the mere addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. This is the case here; the SODEXO mark of the Complainant is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") (in this case ".cam") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the 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 Complainant focuses on the fact that its trademark is highly distinctive and famous and provides suitable evidence of its reputation, adding that it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of this when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The nature of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's distinctive and famous mark plus the letter "x" cannot be considered fair use as these, in the Panel's view, signal the Respondent's intention to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant and its company.

Finally, 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

As stated in paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must show registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. These are concurrent requirements.

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 Complainant has rights and is the owner of the distinctive and globally well-known mark SODEXO, which is registered and used in many jurisdictions around the world long before the registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant registered and is using domain names containing the mark SODEXO, especially <sodexo.com> to host its official website.

It is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. This finding is supported by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive trademark SODEXO in its entirety and merely adds the letter "x" at the end which even strengthens the impression that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its distinctive mark when registering the disputed domain name. Finally, a simple online search for "sodexo" would have shown the Complainant and its marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.3. Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

Although there is no evidence that the disputed domain name is being actively used or resolved to a website with substantive content, UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" or "parking" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of these proceedings. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put, and (iii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

On the basis of the evidence and documents put forward in the Complaint, the Panel finds that the Complainant has a strong online presence worldwide, its trademark SODEXO is distinctive, famous, and globally well-known and the Respondent did not submit a Response; moreover the composition of the disputed domain name (incorporating the SODEXO mark in its entirety) supports the finding 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <sodexox.cam> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026