

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. j n

Case No. D2025-2714

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is j n, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sdoexo.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 9, 2025. On July 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 11, 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 (Domains By Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 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 July 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 July 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 19, 2025. On August 25, 2025, the Center received an email communication from an email address which is slightly different from the Respondent's email address confirmed by the Registrar, stating "I'm not sure what this has to do with my company. Are you sure you meant to include [the Respondent's email address confirmed by the Registrar]?"

The Center appointed Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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 operates the webpage “www.sodexo.com”, to promote its specialized services in food and facilities management as well as communicate the company’s corporate image and maintaining its online presence. The Complainant provides services worldwide and is recognized as a global brand.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations including SODEXO and SODEXHO word marks and design marks in the European Union, United Kingdom, the United States, and numerous other jurisdictions. See, e.g., French Trademark Registration No. 4697571 for SODEXO, registered on March 12, 2021, United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00908346462 for SODEXO, registered on February 1, 2010, International Trademark Registration No. 964615, registered on January 8, 2008.

This dispute concerns the disputed domain name <sdoexo.com> which was created on April 15, 2025, and the controversy is due to the use of the disputed domain name as a mechanism to confuse the Complainant’s clients with fraudulent email communications and thus obtain undue profits to the detriment of the Complainant and its client (phishing).

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 Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is similar to its trademark and causes confusion with its SODEXO trademark, since the only difference is that the letters “o” and “d” are interchanged, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Phonetically, they are similar.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with it and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, either express or implied, to use the SODEXO or SODEXHO trademarks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to confuse the Complainant’s customers by sending them emails as if it were the Complainant, making the customer believe that the communication is from the Complainant, which does not confer any rights or legitimate interests. On the contrary, such impersonation to obtain undue profits is known as “phishing”. Furthermore, there is no evidence to indicate that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that its SODEXO trademark is well known and was registered years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain name to engage in phishing.

B. Respondent

Except for the email communication received by the Center as mentioned in section 3 above, the Center did not receive any email communication from the Respondent’s email address confirmed by the Registrar, in reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 SODEXO trademark and the term "sdoexo" contain the same number of letters and the same letters. The only difference between the SODEXO trademark and the term "sdoexo" is the inversion of the letters "o" and "d" in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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](#), 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 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 Panel finds that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name for sending fraudulent emails constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy because the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, clients and Internet users by using the disputed domain name to create confusion with the Complainant's trademark. Further, the Panel finds that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing, constitutes bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

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 <sdoexo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Cristian, L. Calderón Rodriguez/

Cristian, L. Calderón Rodriguez

Sole Panelist

Date: September 8, 2025