

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Sodexo v. KARAN SINGH, SODEXO

Case No. D2025-4260

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is KARAN SINGH, SODEXO, India.

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

The disputed domain name <hrsodexo.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 17, 2025. On October 17, 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 for Privacy, 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 20, 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 19, 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 with filing date June 8, 2009, and in the same classes in Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Mozambique pursuant to International Registration no. 1240316 filed 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 35-42 in India under no. 1635770 filed on December 28, 2007 claiming priority from French registration no. 073513766 of July 16, 2007, and in classes 9, 16 and 35-45 in numerous other countries pursuant to International Registration no. 964615 filed on January 8, 2008 claiming priority from the same French registration.

The disputed domain name was created on October 16, 2025. It does not currently locate any active website.

#### **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 consists of the Complainant's distinctive mark together with the letters “hr”, which the Complainant observes are a common abbreviation of the generic term “human resources”. The Complainant submits that these letters do not distinguish the disputed domain name from its mark.

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 points out that the sign SODEXO is purely fanciful and that no one could choose to use this word unless seeking to create an association with the Complainant.

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

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

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

The Complainant has shown that it has registered rights in the mark, SODEXO, for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's mark, SODEXO, 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 elements may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements 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.

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.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the Respondent's use of "SODEXO" as its organization name does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under the circumstances of this case.

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 consists primarily of 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 found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith use under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith use 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 <hrsodexo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Jonathan Turner/*

**Jonathan Turner**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 3, 2025