

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Roy Adams, Abtek
Case No. D2025-5223

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Roy Adams, Abtek, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lsodexo.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 15, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 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 (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 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 December 18, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Uwa Ohiku as the sole panelist in this matter on January 14, 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, Sodexo (formerly Sodexho Alliance), is a French limited company founded in 1966 and specialized in food and facilities management services. According to the available information, the Complainant has a labor force of over 426,000 worldwide and serves approximately 80 million consumers daily, with most of its 2025 consolidated revenue figures generated from North America and Europe. The Complainant promoted its business as SODEXHO from 1966 to 2008 and since then, as SODEXO.

The Complainant owns many domain names, including <sodexo.com>, <sodexoca.com>, and <sodexho.com>, respectively. The Complainant also owns the following trademark registrations amongst several others worldwide:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 006104657 for , registered on July 16, 2007;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 008346462 for SODEXO, registered on February 1, 2010;
- International Trademark Registration No. 964615 for , registered on January 8, 2008; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 689106 for Sodexho, registered on January 28, 1998.

Previous UDRP panels have recognized the distinctive nature and international well-known status of the Complainant's mark SODEXO. See *Sodexo v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1580](#); *Sodexo v. Daniela Ortiz*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0628](#); *Sodexo v. Italo Trentino*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3714](#), et al. The Complainant's rights in its SODEXO trademark have also been recognized and upheld by numerous prior UDRP Panel decisions, which ordered the transfers of the disputed domain names to the Complainant. See also, *Sodexo v. li jiang*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0211](#); *Sodexo v. Bernard Acosta*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2806](#), et al.

The Respondent is an individual located in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 5, 2025, and according to evidence submitted when the Complaint was filed, resolved to a pay-per-click parking page comprising third party commercial links. This is unchanged at the time of the Panel's Decision.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied all three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name (that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has established rights; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith), and provides copious information and documentary evidence by way of several annexures and references to numerous previous UDRP panel decisions in support of its contentions in its Complaint.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any other rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

The Respondent did not file a response to the Complainant’s assertions, but the Complainant must establish all three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name and the Panel has a responsibility to review all the relevant evidence and annexed materials provided in the Complaint to verify that all three elements are indeed established. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.3.

The Panel may also carry out limited independent research in discharging its responsibility, under the general powers of the Panel, amongst others, specified in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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 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 that the entirety of the Complainant’s SODEXO mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Further, the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity as this is a standard registration requirement.

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 by 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. Thus, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element then 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, as in this case, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Complainant’s un rebutted assertions, the preponderance of evidence submitted as annexures to the Complaint, and the failure of the Respondent to come forward to establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 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 the present case, the Panel notes the following, amongst several other un rebutted facts and evidence:

- that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant had started using and registered its trademarks and well after the Complainant's services became well established, well-known and garnered substantial international reputation and, in the circumstances, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant before registering the disputed domain name;
- that the Complainant's mark SODEXO is purely fanciful and given its distinctive nature, in the Panel's view, the Respondent targeted the Complainant and registered the disputed domain name to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant;
- that given the international reputation and spread of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew or should have known of the registration and use of the Complainant's trademarks prior to registering the disputed domain name and a basic search of publicly available records would have revealed the Complainant's earlier rights in the SODEXO mark;
- that previous UDRP panels have consistently held that the registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely known trademark, as in this case, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4);
- that the unauthorized registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent is intentionally to attract and redirect Internet users to click on unrelated third-party commercial links, solely for the Respondent's commercial gain, and this constitutes bad faith registration and use;
- that the Respondent's use of a privacy shield, in addition to the Respondent's failure to file a response to the Complainant assertions, can be upheld as further evidence of bad faith on the part of the Respondent. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.6).

In the Panel's view, given all the foregoing and the preponderance of the Complainant's undisputed evidence, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, capitalizing on the goodwill attached to the Complainant's trademarks within paragraph 4(b) and (iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under 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 <Isodexo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Uwa Ohiku/

Uwa Ohiku

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026