

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Serkan Hasyakan

Case No. D2025-4234

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Serkan Hasyakan, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexobozdurma.com> is registered with Isimtescil Bilişim A.Ş (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 15, 2025. On October 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 17, 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 (REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 22, 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 October 23, 2025.

On October 22, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Turkish and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Turkish. On October 23, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 November 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Ugur G. Yalçiner as the sole panelist in this matter on December 5, 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, SODEXO, is a French multinational company founded in 1966 and one of the world's leading providers of food services and facilities management. It operates in 45 countries, serving millions of consumers daily. In fiscal year 2024, the Complainant achieved consolidated revenues of EUR 23.8 billion, with the majority generated in North America and Europe. From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant operated under the trademark and trade name SODEXHO before simplifying its name and logo to SODEXO in 2008.

The Complainant is the owner of several national and international trademark registrations consisting of the term SODEXO, some of which are listed below:

- International trademark registration SODEXO with registration No. 964615, registered on January 8, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.
- International trademark registration SODEXO with registration No. 1240316, registered on October 23, 2014, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.
- European Union trademark registration SODEXO with registration No. 008346462, registered on February 1, 2010, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.
- European Union trademark registration SODEXO with registration No. 006104657, registered on June 27, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.

Besides several domain names including the mark SODEXO, the Complainant also owns the domain name <sodexo.com>, which was registered on October 9, 1998, and redirected to "www.sodexo.com".

The disputed domain name <sodexobozdurma.com> was registered on October 11, 2025, and resolves to an active website that prominently displays the trademark SODEXO and offers to convert balances of SODEXO and other branded meal cards into cash.

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. The Complaint includes the following contentions:

(i) Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name <sodexobozdurma.com> incorporates the SODEXO trademark in its entirety with only the addition of the Turkish word "bozdurma," meaning "exchange, conversion, cash out," which does not distinguish it from the Complainant's well-known trademark and that the Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant's well-known SODEXO trademark when registering the domain name. The Respondent is said to use the disputed domain name to direct users to a website offering to exchange SODEXO tickets and other meal cards into cash, repeatedly using the SODEXO mark and creating the impression of authorization. The Complainant notes that SODEXO is still

associated with its former employee benefit and reward services despite their rebranding to Pluxee. According to the Complainant, the website is fraudulent and aims to mislead customers to obtain their data or vouchers.

(ii) Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as he holds no prior rights in SODEXO as a corporate name, trade name, shop sign, mark, or domain name. The Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name prior to the Complainant's adoption and use of the SODEXO or SODEXHO tradename and trademark, and he has no affiliation, association, sponsorship, or connection with the Complainant. The Complainant further affirms that the Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to register or use the disputed domain name.

(iii) Registration and Use in Bad Faith

The Complainant submits that SODEXO is a purely fanciful sign that no one could legitimately adopt without intending to create an association with the Complainant's activities, and given the well-known character of the SODEXO or SODEXHO trademark, the Respondent obviously knew of its existence when registering the disputed domain name, fully aware that he had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights and with the intention of creating confusion for illegitimate profit. The disputed domain name redirects to a website proposing to convert SODEXO meal cards into cash and also refers to the website "www.nakitecevir.com" offering similar services, none of which are endorsed by the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is used to defraud Complainant's customers by stealing personal or banking data or vouchers under the pretense of providing refunds, and such unauthorized registration and fraudulent use constitute bad faith. The Complainant further notes that this is not the first dispute involving the Respondent, who previously registered <sodexonakitecevirme.com> and <sodexonakitecevirme.click> for similar purposes; in that case, (*Sodexo v. FBS INC /Whoisprotection.biz / Serkan Hasyakan*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-4328](#)) the Panel found that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the SODEXO trademark and may have sought to obtain meal card owners' bank details for illegitimate purposes.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Turkish. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that paragraph 11 of the Rules aims to ensure fairness by considering the parties' comfort with each language, the costs and delays associated with translations, and because the Complainant cannot communicate in Turkish and would otherwise face undue delay and significant translation expenses.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Proceedings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three elements are present:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent 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 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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is the owner of the SODEXO trademarks registered around the world.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark SODEXO, with the additional Turkish word "bozdurma," meaning "exchange, conversion, cash out". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy referring to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. In this regard, the Panel considers mere addition of the Turkish term does not avoid the confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademarks. (See also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8 and the cases cited therein, finding that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.)

It is an accepted principle that generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs"), in this case ".com", are to be typically disregarded in the consideration of the issue of whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. Disregarding the gTLD ".com", the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks and that the requirements in paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy are fulfilled

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 notes that the Respondent does not have any registered trademarks or trade names and no license or authorization of any other kind has been given to the Respondent by the Complainant to use its registered trademark. On the contrary, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the trademark SODEXO and offers to convert balances of SODEXO and other branded meal cards into cash.

The Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s trademark, to promote the conversion of the Complainant’s meal cards into cash does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy. Such conduct cannot give rise to any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent.

As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy are therefore fulfilled by the Complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Panel is satisfied with the relevant evidence filed by the Complainant showing that it owns trademark rights for SODEXO, which has been registered and used for many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

Noting that the Respondent was subject to a prior UDRP proceeding concerning a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trademark, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its well-known trademark when the disputed domain name was registered, and the Respondent’s aim of the registration was to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark. Several UDRP panels have held that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel is convinced that the purpose of the Respondent is to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark for potential commercial gain within the meaning or paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. This finding is supported by the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for a website offering services related to converting or cashing out SODEXO meal card balances. The website displays various commercial offers for purchasing SODEXO card credits and appears to target consumers seeking to exchange their meal card balances for cash.

The Panel also considers that by registering several domain names that are all confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, see for example, <sodexonakitecevirme.com>, <sodexonakitecevirme.click> (*Sodexo v. FBS INC /Whoisprotection.biz / Serkan Hasyakan*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-4328](#)) the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations which is a further indicator of the Respondent's bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2. The Panel shares the view expressed in that previous case that the offer to provide cash in return for meal card balances suggests that the disputed domain name is intended, or may already have been used, to obtain the banking details of misled meal card holders for illegitimate purposes. Moreover, the Respondent's prominent use of the SODEXO trademark both in the disputed domain name and on the associated website, without any visible disclaimer clarifying the absence of a relationship with the Complainant, further supports the conclusion that the Respondent seeks to create confusion and to mislead users as to a non-existent affiliation.

Having considered all the facts in this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has sustained its burden of proof in showing that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <sodexobozdurma.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ugur G. Yalçiner/

Ugur G. Yalçiner

Sole Panelist

Date: December 9, 2025