

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Joseph buechner, Joes buenchr
Case No. D2025-5100

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Joseph buechner, Joes buenchr, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexocom.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 December 8, 2025. On December 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 10, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 10, 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 11, 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 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Johan Sjöbeck as the sole Panelist in this matter on January 9, 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 Complainant, a French company specialized in food services and facilities management and has submitted evidence that it is the owner of a large number of trademark registrations for SODEXHO and SODEXO in numerous jurisdictions, including the following:

- SODEXO, International Trademark (device) with registration number 964615, registered on January 8, 2008, under priority of the French trademark registration number 3513766 of July 16, 2007, renewed in 2018, for International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45;
- SODEXO, International Trademark (word) with registration number 1240316, registered on October 23, 2014, for International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45;
- SODEXHO, International Trademark (device) with registration number 689106, registered on January 28, 1998, based on the French trademark registration number 96654774 of December 10, 1996, renewed in 2018, for International Classes 16, 36, 37, 39, 41 and 42;
- SODEXHO, International Trademark (device) with registration number 694302, registered on June 22, 1998, under priority of the French trademark registration number 98714920 of January 27, 1998, renewed in 2018, for International Class 9;
- SODEXO, European Union Trade Mark ("EUTM") (word) with registration number 008346462, filed on June 8, 2009, renewed in 2019, for International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45; and
- SODEXO, EUTM (device) with registration number 006104657, filed on July 16, 2007, renewed in 2017, for International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.

The disputed domain name <sodexocom.com> was registered by the Respondent on December 3, 2025. According to the submitted evidence, the disputed domain name is being used to direct Internet users to a pay-per-click parking 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.

The Complainant was founded in 1966 and is one of the largest companies in the world specialized in food services and facilities management with over 426,000 employees serving 80 million consumers in 43 countries. The Complainant's consolidated revenues amounted to EUR 24,1 billion for the fiscal year 2025. The Complainant is listed as one of "The world's Most Admired Companies" by Fortune Magazine.

From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the SODEXHO trademark. In 2008, the Complainant simplified the spelling of the SODEXHO trademark to SODEXO and updated the logo. The Complainant provides a wide range of services under its SODEXO trademark through an offer of on-site services, food services and facility management services. The Complainant owns numerous domain names corresponding to and/or containing the trademarks SODEXO and SODEXHO including the domain name <sodexo.com>. The SODEXO trademarks are used and protected in a large number of countries; including

in the United States where the Respondent is located. The Complainant's trademarks have a strong reputation and are widely known all over the world. Multiple prior panels have recognized the SODEXO trademark as distinctive and well known. See for example, *Sodexo v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1580](#), *SODEXO v. Zhichao Yang (杨智超)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2286](#), and *SODEXO v. Ashutosh Dwivedi, Food & Beverages*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2686](#).

The disputed domain name <sodexocom.com> is composed of the distinctive SODEXO trademark, with the addition of the element “com” at the end. The expression “sodexocom” clearly refers to the Complainant’s official website “www.sodexo.com” where the element “com” is being perceived as the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”). The addition of the element “com” in the disputed domain name at issue is not sufficient to distinguish it from the Complainant’s trademarks. In the disputed domain name, the trademark is perceived by consumers as the predominant part. The addition of generic or descriptive terms to a mark will not alter the fact that the domain name at issue is confusingly similar to the mark in question.

The Respondent uses a typosquatting practice intended to create confusion in the public mind between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. Given the identical reproduction of the trademark, the public will believe that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant. Furthermore, the Complainant has recently been the target of several attacks and has a well-founded concern that the disputed domain name could be used for fraudulent purposes, in particular for phishing activities.

The disputed domain name is registered in the name of Joseph Buechner from “Joes buenchr” who is unknown to the Complainant. The Respondent has no rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as he has no rights to SODEXO corporate name, trade name, shop sign, mark or domain name that would be prior to the Complainant's rights. The Respondent was not commonly known by the concerned domain name prior to the adoption and use by the Complainant of the corporate name, business name and trademark. Moreover, the Respondent does not have any affiliation, association, sponsorship or connection with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant or by any subsidiary or affiliated company to register and use the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad by the Respondent. The Complainant's trademark SODEXO is purely fanciful and nobody could legitimately choose this word or any variation thereof, unless seeking to create an association with the Complainant's activities and trademark. Given the well-known character and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent knew its existence when he registered the disputed domain name, so that he was aware that he had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that he cannot lawfully use it. Previous UDRP decisions recognize that actual knowledge of a complainant's trademarks and activities at the time of the registration of a disputed domain name may be considered an inference of bad faith.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name by exploiting the confusion with the well-known trademark to attract Internet users and to incite them to click on third party commercial links. This is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to unrelated websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's well-known trademark. The use of the disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising pay-per-click links does not represent a bona fide offering as such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of a complainant's trademark or may mislead Internet users. The unauthorized registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent to attract and redirect Internet users to unrelated websites are solely for the purpose of achieving commercial gain and then constitute bad faith registration and use. Moreover, consumers having an interest in the Complainant may be exposed to the Respondent's parking services that propose advertising links to third party websites. This may not only cause confusion among consumers, but may also result in dilution of the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, bad faith use may also be established by the risk of abusive use of the disputed domain name, such as for phishing or other fraudulent activities. The Respondent's unauthorized registration of the disputed domain name, with the apparent aim of enabling such fraudulent use for commercial gain, constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name 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 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 test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant is, according to the submitted evidence, the owner of the registered trademark SODEXO. The disputed domain name <sodexocom.com> incorporates the trademark in its entirety with the addition of the element "com", commonly perceived as a gTLD. The trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name and the addition of the element "com" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Furthermore, it is the standard practice to disregard the gTLD under the confusingly similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

Having the above in mind, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark SODEXO and that the Complainant has proven the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, in particular but without limitation, any of the following:

- (i) that the Respondent uses or has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the notice to the Respondent of the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

From the submitted material in the Complaint and its annexes, it is clear that the Complainant's trademark registrations for SODEXO predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, it is clear that the Complainant has not licensed, approved, or in any way consented to the Respondent's registration and use of the trademark in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, directs Internet users to a commercial pay-per-click parking website. Given the above, the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's *prima facie* case. The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to demonstrate that the Respondent is the owner of any trademark rights similar to the disputed domain name or that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

By not submitting a response, the Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstances which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case that refutes the Complainant's submissions, and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has also proved the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use include without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the disputed domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided there is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on that website or location.

As previously noted, the Complainant's trademark registrations for the trademark SODEXO predate the registration of the disputed domain name. It has been argued by the Complainant that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of creating a likelihood of confusion, or at least an impression of association, between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. According to several UDRP decisions referenced by the Complainant, the Complainant's trademark is recognized as distinctive and well known. See for example *Sodexo v. Domain Administrator, NameSilo, LLC*, WIPO Case

No. [D2024-0157](#), *Sodexo v. Heather Gomez, Sodexo*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1573](#), and *SODEXO v. Simo Kinnunen, Telcoin Pte. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3494](#).

In light of the above, and considering that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, with the sole modification being the addition of the element "com", the Panel finds that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name constitutes a clear case of typosquatting. This deliberate variation is likely to capture Internet users who mistakenly add or misinterpret the "com" element when seeking the Complainant's official website. The Panel therefore concludes that there is no plausible explanation for the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name other than to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location, or of products or services offered thereon.

Hence, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is persuaded on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark and business in mind. There is no evidence in this case that refutes the Complainant's submissions and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proved the requirements under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy that the disputed domain name has been registered and 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 <sodexocom.com> shall be transferred to the Complainant.

/Johan Sjöbeck/

Johan Sjöbeck

Sole Panelist

Date: January 14, 2026