

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Angel Carchenilla Surpanelu

Case No. D2025-1589

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Angel Carchenilla Surpanelu, United Kingdom ("UK").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexold.info> 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 April 18, 2025. On April 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 22, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 30, 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 May 5, 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 May 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Anita Gerewal as the sole panelist in this matter on June 13, 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

Founded in 1966, the Complainant, SODEXO (formerly known as SODEXHO ALLIANCE), is a French company, specializing in food services and facilities management.

The Complainant was known as SODEXHO ALLIANCE, from 1966 to 2008, and promoted its business under the SODEXHO trademark and trade name. In 2008, the spelling of its trademark was simplified into SODEXO, including a logo change.

The Complainant has 423,000 employees serving daily 80 million consumers in 45 countries. For fiscal year 2024, the Complainant's consolidated revenues reached EUR 23,8 billion which represent by region: 47% North America, 35 % Europe, and 18 % for the rest of the world.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations internationally, including the following:

- UK Trademark Registration No. UK00908346462 for SODEXO in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, registered on February 1, 2010.
- UK Trademark Registration No. UK00800964615 *sodexo** in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, registered on May 25, 2009, claiming priority under the French trademark registration no 07 3 513 766 8 dated July 16, 2007.
- International trademark registration No. 964615 *sodexo** in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, registered on January 8, 2008.
- International trademark registration No. 1240316 SODEXO, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, registered on October 23, 2014

The Complainant is also the owner of a large domain names portfolio, including <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 April 15, 2025 and currently resolves to a parked page with pay-per-click ("PPC") links.

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 composed of the identical sign SODEXO, and the element LTD, which is understood as the abbreviation of the British type of legal entity "limited company". The mark SODEXO remains dominant and keeps its individuality and attractive character in the disputed domain name. The addition of the element "Ltd" in the disputed domain name is inoperative to distinguish it from the Complainant's mark SODEXO. On the contrary, the risk of confusion or association with the SODEXO mark is stronger as several UK subsidiaries of the Complainant are "Limited Companies".

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The trademark SODEXO has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its products/services. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark SODEXO at the time it registered the disputed domain name. The unauthorized registration and use of the disputed domain

name by the Respondent to attract and redirect Internet users to websites of Complainant's competitors are solely for the purpose of achieving commercial gain and that constitute bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant also submitted that the SODEXO mark has a strong reputation and is widely known all over the world. Its well-known character has been acknowledged by various panels in previous UDRP proceedings, as cited by the Complainant in the Complaint.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed 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, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the SODEXO trademark 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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "Ltd" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms and the generic Top-Level Domain does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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 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.

Indeed, it appears that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark; and that the Respondent has no intent to use the disputed domain name with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page comprising PPC links.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising ppc links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that given the prior registrations and use by the Complainant of the SODEXO trademark; the distinctiveness of the Complainant's SODEXO trademark; the incorporation of the Complainant's SODEXO trademark in its entirety in the disputed domain name with mere addition of the generic term, "Ltd"; and that the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page with PPC links, indeed in this Panel's view, the Respondent intended to attract Internet users accessing the website corresponding to the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website and the products offered therein, for its commercial gain, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and as such the Panel finds that the disputed domain name 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 <sodexold.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anita Gerewal/

Anita Gerewal

Sole Panelist

Date: June 27, 2025