ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Sodexo v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-5434

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Name Redacted[1].

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexoideducorp.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 30, 2025. On December 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 30, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0176971386) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 2, 2026, 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 January 7, 2026.

[1] The Respondent appears to have used the name and contact details of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the name of the Respondent from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the concerned Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name provided as the registrant of the disputed domain name. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the concerned Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

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 January 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Zeynep Yasaman as the sole panelist in this matter on February 2, 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 is a French company founded in 1966, and is one of the largest companies in the world, specialized in food services and facilities management, with more than 426,000 employees serving 80 million consumers daily in 43 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of SODEXO trademarks registered in various jurisdictions, including:

- the Indonesian SODEXO trademark, No. IDM000217466, registered on July 9, 2020, in classes 35, 36, and 37;
- the Indonesian SODEXO trademark, No. IDM000217467, registered on July 9, 2020, in classes 38, 39, and 40; and
- the international SODEXO trademark, No. 964615, registered on January 8, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names corresponding to and/or containing SODEXO, such as <sodexo.com>, <uk.sodexo.com>, <sodexoprestige.co.uk>, <sodexo.fr>, <sodexoca.com>, <sodexousa.com>, and <cn.sodexo.com>.

The disputed domain name <sodexoideducorp> was registered on December 22, 2025, and does not resolve to any active website.

Based on the documents submitted in the case file, the Respondent has apparently used the name of an actual employee of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the marks SODEXO and SODEXHO, in which the Complainant has established rights. The Complainant submits that the SODEXO and SODEXHO marks are registered in numerous jurisdictions worldwide and that the Sodexo group is widely established internationally, including in Indonesia. According to the Complainant, its SODEXO and SODEXHO marks enjoy a strong reputation and are well known globally. The Complainant further notes that previous panels already recognized the well-known character of those marks.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is composed of its SODEXO mark together with the expression "id edu corp". This expression, in the Complainant's view, may refer to identification services for users in the education sector or to the Complainant's activities in that sector in Indonesia, with "id" being understood as an abbreviation for Indonesia. The Complainant states that it has a strong presence in schools and universities, including in Indonesia. The Complainant maintains that within the disputed domain name the element "Sodexo" remains dominant, retains its distinctive character, and constitutes the most attractive and recognizable component. The addition of the term "ideducorp" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Given the incorporation of the SODEXO mark in its entirety, Internet users would likely believe that the disputed domain name is associated with, endorsed by, or originates from the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name while impersonating a real employee of the Complainant. The Complainant characterizes this conduct as identity theft. The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights in SODEXO as a corporate name, trade name, sign, trademark, or domain name that would predate the Complainant's rights. Nor has the Respondent been commonly known by the disputed domain name prior to the Complainant's adoption and use of its marks. The Complainant adds that the Respondent has no affiliation, association, sponsorship, or connection with the Complainant and has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant or any of its affiliates to register or use the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the alleged well-known character and reputation of the SODEXO and SODEXHO marks, the Complainant argues that the Respondent must have been aware of those marks at the time of registration and therefore knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights and likely for the purpose of creating confusion with the Complainant's mark in order to divert or mislead third parties for illegitimate gain. The Complainant further argues that even if the disputed domain name does not resolve to active content, passive holding does not preclude a finding of bad faith. According to the Complainant, the unauthorized registration and holding of the disputed domain name, likely for fraudulent purposes, constitutes bad faith registration and use. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent's alleged impersonation of an employee of the Complainant in registering the disputed domain name constitutes further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the complainant to show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which it has rights.

Where a complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.2.1. In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant owns several registered SODEXO trademarks. Accordingly, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces entirely the Complainant's SODEXO trademark with the addition of the terms "id", "edu", "corp", and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". It is well established by panels applying the Policy that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. Similarly, the applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such, is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11. In that regard, the Panel considers that while the addition of the terms "id", "edu", and "corp" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the addition of such terms 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. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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. These are as follows:

(i) before any notice of the dispute, the respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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 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.

The Panel notes that there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant has also established that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant nor authorized or licensed to use the SODEXO trademark or register the disputed domain name.

Where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the Second- or Top-Level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, which entirely incorporates the Complainant's trademark SODEXO together with the addition of the term "ideducorp", where "id" is a commonly recognized abbreviation for Indonesia, "edu"

for education, and “corp” for corporation, falsely creates the impression of a corporate entity of the Complainant operating in the education sector in Indonesia. The Panel considers that such a composition cannot constitute fair use as it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.1.

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:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) that the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) that by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent’s website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the respondent’s website or location.

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 that the Complainant’s trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant’s SODEXO trademark is a distinctive and well-known mark. It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name, which incorporates the SODEXO mark in its entirety.

The Panel further observes that the addition of the term “ideducorp”, composed of the elements “id”, “edu”, and “corp”, reinforces the impression that the disputed domain name refers to a corporate entity of the Complainant operating in the education sector in Indonesia, since “id” is a commonly recognized abbreviation for Indonesia, “edu” for education, and “corp” for corporation. In the Panel’s view, this composition increases the likelihood that Internet users would mistakenly assume that the disputed domain name designates an official Indonesian educational division or affiliate of the Complainant.

Although the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, panels applying the UDRP have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3. Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3.). In the present case, having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent’s failure to

submit a response, and the alleged identity theft 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 under the Policy.

The Panel notes that the registrant name disclosed by the Registrar corresponds to the name of an individual who, according to the evidence on record, is an employee of the Complainant. In the absence of any plausible explanation, the use of such a third party identity — particularly that of a person associated with the Complainant — further supports the Panel's finding of bad faith. UDRP panels have considered the provision of false or misleading registrant information, or the misappropriation of another person's identity, as further indicia of bad faith registration and use. See, e.g., *Bread Financial Payments, Inc. v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2024-3080 (finding potential identity theft where registrant details corresponded to a complainant's employee supports a finding of bad faith), and *Inriver AB v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2025-4013 (noting that use of a third party's contact details may support a finding of bad faith).

In light of the above, 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 <sodexoideducorp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zeynep Yasaman/
Zeynep Yasaman
Sole Panelist
Date: February 13, 2026