

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD
Case No. D2025-5440

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <www.sodexolink.com> is registered with Media Elite Holdings Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 30, 2025. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 3, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 6, 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 8, 2026.

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 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin as the sole panelist in this matter on February 4, 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 following summary sets out the uncontested factual submission made by the Complainant:

The Complainant was founded in 1966 and is, today, one of the largest companies in the world specializing in food services and facilities management.

The scale of the Complainant's business is evidenced by its staff strength of 426,000 employees worldwide serving 80 million consumers daily, throughout 43 countries. Consequently, the Complainant is also one of the largest employers worldwide. The enormity of the Complainant's business is further evidenced by its financial performance where for the fiscal year 2025, the Complainant's consolidated global revenues reached 24.1 billion EUR. These achievements have resulted in the Complainant being listed as one of "The World's Most Admired Companies" by FORTUNE Magazine.

From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business using the SODEXHO trademark and trade name. In 2008, however, the trademark and trade name was simplified to SODEXO (the "Trademark").

The Trademark is used in connection with food services ranging from restaurant and catering services to companies, hospitals, schools, universities and a range of other organizations. Additionally, the Complainant's food services extend to food delivery and digital food ordering services.

The Trademark is also used in connection with facility management services ranging from reception, hospitality and cleaning services (soft facility management) and infrastructure maintenance services (hard facility management).

The Trademark and its variations are continuously and extensively used and registered worldwide. The following table includes a sample of registrations of the Trademark owned by the Complainant:

| Jurisdiction | Mark | Registration Number | Date of Registration | Classification of Goods / Services |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| Panama | SODEXO (stylized) | 167186-01 167188-01 167190-01 167191-01 167193-01 167194-01 167195-01 167196-01 167197-01 167198-01 167199-01 167200-01 167201-01 | December 12, 2007 | 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45 respectively |
| European Trademark | SODEXO (stylized) | 006104657 | June 27, 2008 | 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45 |
| International Trademark | SODEXO (stylized) | 964615 | January 8, 2008 | 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45 |
| European Trademark | SODEXO | 008346462 | February 1, 2010 | 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45. |
| International Trademark | SODEXO | 1240316 | October 23, 2014 | 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45 |

The notoriety, goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's business and the Trademark have been recognized in various UDRP proceedings including *Sodexo v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1580](#); *SODEXO v. Zhichao Yang (杨□□)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2286](#); *SODEXO v. Ashutosh Dwivedi, Food & Beverages*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2686](#); *Sodexo v. Daniela Ortiz*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0628](#); *Sodexo v. bin quan wang, wang bin quan*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0629](#); *Sodexo v. Yang Zhichao (杨□□)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0902](#); *Sodexo v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 12412617261, Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 12412617261 / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1399](#); *Sodexo v. li jiang*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0211](#); *Sodexo v. Jerry Anderson*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2023-0023](#); *Sodexo v. Veera Raghava*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1370](#); *Sodexo v. chengao*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1894](#); *Sodexo v. Domain Administrator, NameSilo, LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0157](#); and *Sodexo v. Sebastian Barra Alarcon, Sodexo*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0501](#).

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names corresponding to and/or comprising the Trademark. These include <sodexo.com>, <uk.sodexo.com>, <sodexoprestige.co.uk>, <sodexo.fr>, <sodexoca.com>, <sodexousa.com>, <cn.sodexo.com>, <sodexho.fr>, and <sodexho.com>. Additionally, the Complainant also owns the domain name <sodexolink.com> which is the official platform for its employees and which was created on March 17, 2015.

The disputed domain name was created on August 20, 2018 and resolves to a website that offers online gambling and betting services.

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, inter alia, as follows:

The Complainant asserts that the Trademark is distinctive, is a well-known trademark that is used globally and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Trademark for the following reasons:

(a) the Trademark is the most distinctive element in the disputed domain name and the addition of the words "www" and "link" does not change that fact and would instead cause Internet users to be confused as to whether an association exists between the disputed domain name and the Complainant. This likelihood is exacerbated by the fact that the Complainant also owns and operates its official employee platform located at the website "www.sodexolink.com";

(b) the likely conclusion drawn by Internet users would be that the disputed domain name is owned, operated, or somehow linked to the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain name because:

(a) the Respondent has no rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain name or the Trademark whether as a corporate name, trade name, signage, mark, or domain name that would predate the Complainant's rights to the Trademark;

(b) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor was it validly known as such prior to the date on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name;

(c) the Respondent is not in any way related, affiliated, associated, sponsored or connected to the Complainant and neither has the Complainant licensed or authorized the Respondent to register or to use the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith and relies on the following:

(a) the Respondent had constructive notice of the Trademark given the notoriety of the Trademark and the fact that the Complainant's rights to the Trademark accrued well before the registration of the disputed domain name. In respect thereof, the Complainant relies on several previous UDRP decisions related to the Trademark which lends support to this contention (see *Sodexo v. Heather Gomez*, *Sodexo*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1573](#); *Sodexo v. Supreme Forest, Semper Solaris*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2997](#); *SODEXO v. Simo Kinnunen, Telcoin Pte. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3494](#); *Sodexo v. Kevin Yao, Domain Admin*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3653](#); and *Sodexo v. Italo Trentino* WIPO Case No. [D2025-3714](#));

(b) the Trademark comprises a fanciful word and that it would be implausible for the Respondent to have selected this word except to create an association with the Complainant and its business;

(c) the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website. This is evidenced by the offerings of online gambling and betting services through the website to which the disputed domain name redirects. Internet users who have a legitimate interest in the Complainant's offerings could have been exposed to this website. In any event, even if Internet users were not confused as to the association between the Complainant and the website, the adverse effect would have been a dilution or tarnishing of the distinctiveness and reputation of the Trademark;

(d) given the well-known status of the Trademark, there is no reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name other than to ride on the reputation and goodwill of the Trademark;

(e) the Respondent has a record of past similar conduct including proceedings involving the Complainant and the Trademark. In each of these cases, the panel ordered for the transfer of the domain names in question (see *Sodexo v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3588](#); *Sodexo v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0472](#); *Sodexo v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0315](#); and *Sodexo v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3422](#)).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant is required to establish the following elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (a) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (b) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (c) that 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 (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 is satisfied with the evidence adduced by the Complainant of various international registrations of the Trademark as well as marketing and business activities and initiatives over the course of many years to build the reputation and goodwill of the Trademark at an international level.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms or characters here, "www" and "link" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that neither the addition of such terms, nor the use of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8 and 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 Complainant has clearly stated that it has not authorized the Respondent in any way to use the Trademark or to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant has also denied any affiliation or association with the Respondent.

The additional terms or characters in the disputed domain name, here, "www" and "link", when used in conjunction with the Trademark do not appear to suggest any alternative, secondary, or descriptive meaning in the English language. Rather, the choice appears designed to resemble the Complainant's own employee platform at "www.sodexolink.com".

Also noting the findings under the third element of the Policy, 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.

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.

Past panels often cite paragraph 4(b)(iv) as one of the circumstances to substantiate evidence of bad faith registration and use. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online 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, then this would justify a finding of bad faith.

The Panel is cognizant of the goodwill attached to the Trademark. This often leads to attempts to hijack or to ride and usurp the goodwill attached thereto by third parties unconnected to the Complainant. The Panel finds that the evidence adduced by the Complainant suggests that the Respondent intended to do so. This includes the following factors:

- (a) the date of registration of the disputed domain name which was long after the Trademark was registered and had acquired distinctiveness and global appeal;
- (b) the decision to include the Trademark, which is a unique and distinctive mark, in its entirety in the disputed domain name;
- (c) the manner in which the Respondent used the disputed domain name to redirect to a gambling and betting website;
- (d) the seemingly deliberate choice and placement of letters that make up the disputed domain name which somehow mimics the domain name used by the Complainant to operate its official employee platform at "www.sodexolink.com". This seems to suggest that the Respondent intended to make a false representation in order to create an impression that the dispute domain name was somehow linked, connected, or associated with the Complainant's official employee platform. In this regard, the Panel notes the minute difference between the two domain names i.e. a missing full stop. Domain mimicry is a common practice of registering domain names that are deliberate misspellings or close variations of well-known domain names, hoping that Internet users mistype the address and land on the squatter's site instead; and
- (e) the pattern of past similar conduct related to the same Trademark by the Respondent.

Having reviewed the record, therefore, 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 <www.sodexolink.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin/

Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin

Sole Panelist

Date: February 11, 2026