

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Sodexo v. Ibrahim Mueller

Case No. D2025-5070

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Ibrahim Mueller, Austria, self-represented.

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

The disputed domain names <sod-exo.top> and <sodexo.top> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 5, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 9, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 9, 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 December 10, 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 December 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on December 15 and December 19, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on January 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 2026. 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 uncontested facts are as follows. The Complainant was founded in 1966 and is a large, multinational food services and facilities management company. From 1966 to 2008 the Complainant traded under the SODEXHO mark, which changed to SODEXO in 2008. The Complainant's SODEXO mark has been recognized as being well known by prior panels under the Policy. See, for e.g., *Sodexo v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1580](#).

The Complainant's mark is registered under, amongst others, European Union Trademark Registration No. 008346462 SODEXO in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, having a registration date of February 1, 2010.

The disputed domain name <sodexo.top> was registered on October 4, 2025, and the disputed domain name <sod-exo.top> was registered on November 25, 2025. At the time the Complaint was filed, both disputed domain names redirected to a Registrar domain name marketplace listing for the disputed domain name <sodexo.top>, offering it for sale for EUR 1,977,777.77. At the time of this Decision, the listed price is USD 2,295,460.30 (EUR 1,977,777.77).

#### **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and have been used in bad faith for the purpose of selling the disputed domain names to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs relating directly to the disputed domain names.

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

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names. Insofar as the Panel is able to make out, the Respondent primarily claims that the disputed domain names are generic as they consist of three dictionary terms "sod", "exo", and "top" plus a hyphen in the disputed domain name <sod-exo.top>, and that the disputed domain names are distinguishable from the Complainant's mark given the use of two distinct terms plus the addition of the ".top" Top-Level Domain ("TLD"). More specifically, the Respondent seems to argue that the term "sod" appears in Wiktionary with different meanings including in English as "stratum of the surface of the soil which is filled with the roots of grass, or any portion of that surface", and a "symbol, namely the (international standards) ISO 639-3 language code symbol for Songoora [language]"; and the term "exo" features in Wiktionary as a French slang word for the English word "exercise" or as form of a verb in Spanish. The Respondent further adds that "no one needs to understand why certain words / characters from different languages got combined."

The Respondent also asserts that the Complaint has been filed in bad faith and requests that the Panel make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”).

## **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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical (in respect of `<sodexo.top>`) and confusingly similar (in respect of `<sod-exo.top>`) to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The addition of a hyphen between the components of the Complainant’s mark within the disputed domain name `<sod-exo.top>` does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity. See *VeriSign Inc. v. Bin g Glu / G Design*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0421](#).

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As discussed further in relation to bad faith below, it is most likely that the Respondent’s intentions were to sell the disputed domain names to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of his documented out-of-pocket costs. This cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1981](#).

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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names with an intention to sell them to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of his documented out-of-pocket costs, falling within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark, as in this case, by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Respondent provided a disclaimer on the sale listing page for the disputed domain name <sodexo.top>, to which both disputed domain names redirect, stating that the Respondent has no connection with the Complainant's company "Sodexo S.A". This in the Panel's view, if anything, shows prior knowledge of the Complainant's mark, which points to bad faith targeting. *Caixa D'Estalvis i Pensions de Barcelona ("La Caixa") v. Eric Adam*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0464](#).

The Complainant's evidence establishes that the Respondent has registered two other domain names that incorporate a mark associated with the Complainant, namely the PLUXEE mark which is associated with a company that was previously part of the Complainant's group and still has shareholders in common with the Complainant. The Respondent registered the domain names <pluxee.top> and <plu-xee.top> in October and November 2025 respectively and has already been found to have targeted the Complainant's group company in respect of the domain name <pluxee.top>, and <plu-xee.top>. See *Pluxee International v. Ibrahim Mueller*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4395](#), and *Pluxee International v. Ibrahim Mueller*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5122](#).

The Panel finds that it cannot have been a coincidence that the Respondent sought to register four domain names that are confusingly similar to the well-known trademarks associated with the Complainant within a short space of time under the same TLD. This points to targeting of the Complainant in the present case.

Turning to the Respondent's claim that the disputed domain names are generic, the fact that the components "sod" and "exo" may be dictionary words in English, French or other languages, as the Respondent claims, does not assist the Respondent. He has provided no cogent explanation for why he chose these particular terms - which, as combined, have no dictionary or conceptual meaning in any of those languages (see *SonarSource SA v. Hasan Kibar*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3938](#)) but represent the Complainant's registered mark, an invented term. In this regard, Internet searches for "sod-exo" return results overwhelmingly relating to the Complainant.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the Panel concludes that in the circumstances of this case, also bearing in mind the Respondent's history of targeting a mark associated with the Complainant and the repute of the Complainant's SODEXO mark, it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names (one being identical to the SODEXO mark) on account of their potential value based on the Complainant's mark.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel makes no finding of the RDNH.

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

## 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 names <sod-exo.top> and <sodexo.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Jeremy Speres/*

**Jeremy Speres**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 17, 2026