

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

SODEXO v. kin ozley  
Case No. D2025-4235

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is kin ozley, United States of America.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <sordexo.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (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 16, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 17, 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 21, 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 October 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Jonathan Turner as the sole panelist in this matter on November 24, 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 was founded in 1966 and has become a leading international business specializing in food services and facilities management. It has 423,000 employees serving 80 million consumers in 45 countries with a turnover of nearly EUR 24 billion in 2024.

From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant operated under the name and mark SODEXHO. Since 2008, it has operated under the name and mark SODEXO.

The Complainant has registered SODEXO as a word mark in classes 9, 16 and 35-45 in the European Union under no. 008346462 registered on February 1, 2010, and in the same classes in Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Mozambique pursuant to International Registration no. 1240316 registered on October 23, 2014.

The Complainant has also registered a logo consisting primarily of the word “sodexo” in stylized lettering in classes 9, 16 and 35-45 in numerous countries, including the United States of America, pursuant to International Registration no. 964615 registered on January 8, 2008, claiming priority from French registration no. 073513766 of July 16, 2007.

The disputed domain name was created on October 6, 2025 and was directed to a web page with links to websites offering free streaming of films.

#### **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 confusingly similar to its registered mark SODEXO.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name or any corresponding name, was not commonly known by it and has no links with the Complainant or authorization from the Complainant to register or use it.

The Complainant also alleges that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant refers to the reputation and distinctive character of its mark SODEXO and infers that the Respondent knew of the mark when registering the disputed domain name.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element of the Policy 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 that it has registered rights in respect of the mark SODEXO for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to this mark, from which it differs only in the addition of a single letter.

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.

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 that the Respondent has no such rights or legitimate interests 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**

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 this case, the disputed domain name is very closely similar to the Complainant's highly distinctive and well-known mark. The Respondent has not identified any bona fide reason for registering it. The Panel infers on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, knowing that it would be associated with the Complainant and with the intention of gaining some advantage from this confusion.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. In this case, the disputed domain name was directed to a web page with links to websites offering free streaming of films, apparently in breach of copyright or related rights. The Panel finds 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 and its mark. 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 <sordexo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Jonathan Turner/*

**Jonathan Turner**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 8, 2025