

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Jessica Martínez, Organization Sodexo Libe  
Case No. D2026-0086

### 1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jessica Martínez, Organization Sodexo Libe, United States of America (“U.S”).

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexoliveweb.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 9, 2026. On January 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 9, 2026, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Sodexo Libe) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 15, 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 15, 2026.

On January 15, 2026 the Center informed the parties in Spanish and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Spanish. On January 15, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Marcello Do Nascimento as the sole panelist in this matter on February 11, 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, is a French multinational corporation headquartered in Paris, France. Founded in 1966, the Complainant is one of the world's largest companies specializing in food services and facilities management. It operates in more than 40 countries worldwide and serves approximately 80 million consumers daily through a workforce exceeding 426,000 employees.

The Complainant provides a broad range of services under the trademarks SODEXO and SODEXO LIVE !, including catering services, hospitality services, facilities management, and related corporate support services. The SODEXO group reports annual revenues in excess of EUR 24 billion, reflecting its substantial commercial presence and global recognition.

The Complaint is based on the Complainant's longstanding trademark rights in the designations SODEXO and SODEXO LIVE !, which long predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

As evidenced by the documentation submitted with the Complaint, the Complainant owns a substantial portfolio of national, regional, and international trademark registrations.

In particular, the Complainant relies on the following trademark registrations (copies submitted with the Complaint and verified by the Panel):

- SODEXO LIVE ! (figurative mark) – International trademark registration No. 1648068, registered on October 15, 2021, under priority of French trademark registration No. 4 786 392 of July 19, 2021, in International Classes 35, 39, 41, 43 and 45.
- SODEXO (word mark) – International trademark registration No. 964615, registered on January 8, 2008, in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, protected in multiple jurisdictions including the United States of America;
- SODEXO (word mark) – European Union trademark registration No. 008346462, registered on February 1, 2020, in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45;
- SODEXO (figurative mark) – European Union trademark registration No. 006104657, registered on June 27, 2008, in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.

The Panel notes that all of the above trademark registrations were obtained well before the registration of the disputed domain name and remain valid and in force. The Complainant is the owner of these registrations, and no evidence has been submitted to challenge their validity.

The Complainant also maintains a substantial online presence and owns numerous domain names incorporating its trademarks, including, inter alia, <sodexo.com>, <sodexousa.com>, <sodexolive.com>, and several domain names under country-code Top-Level Domains reflecting the SODEXO mark.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 26, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive webpage displaying a default page provided by the Registrar. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name continues

to resolve to an inactive webpage. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has made any bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name.

According to the Registrar verification, the Respondent is identified as “Jessica Martinez”, associated with the entity “Sodexo Libe”, with an address in Gaithersburg, Maryland, United States of America. The address provided corresponds to the headquarters of the Complainant’s U.S. subsidiary.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name under a name closely resembling the Complainant’s corporate identity and appears to have used contact details corresponding to the Complainant’s U.S. operations. There is no evidence of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant, nor of any authorization granted to the Respondent to use the Complainant’s trademarks.

## **5. Parties’ Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-established trademarks SODEXO and SODEXO LIVE !, which are reproduced in their entirety and constitute the dominant and distinctive elements of the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the addition of the term “web” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant further submits that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is irrelevant for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity and should be disregarded in the comparison.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name “Sodexo” or “Sodexo Live” and has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating them. The Complainant emphasizes that no business, contractual, or other relationship exists between the Parties.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name using the name “Sodexo Libe” and an address corresponding to the headquarters of the Complainant’s U.S subsidiary, which strongly suggests impersonation and an attempt to create a false association with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, such conduct cannot give rise to any rights or legitimate interests within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has not used, nor made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive page provided by the Registrar, and at the time of this Decision it continues to resolve to an inactive webpage. The Complainant submits that such passive holding does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, particularly where the domain name incorporates a distinctive and well-known trademark.

The Complainant also contends that the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the SODEXO LIVE ! designation with the generic term “web”, creates a clear implied false affiliation. The Complainant submits that Internet users are likely to believe that the disputed domain name corresponds to an official website or online platform operated or authorized by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that its trademark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name and that the SODEXO and SODEXO LIVE ! trademarks are widely known internationally. In the Complainant’s view, the deliberate registration of a domain name incorporating its distinctive trademarks

demonstrates that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and intentionally targeted its brand at the time of registration.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The Complainant relies on established UDRP principles recognizing that, in appropriate circumstances - particularly where a well-known trademark is involved and there is no plausible legitimate use - the passive holding of a domain name may constitute bad faith registration and use.

In light of the foregoing, the Complainant submits that the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are met and requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not submit any Response to the Complaint. Accordingly, the Respondent has not contested the Complainant's assertions nor provided any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, nor any explanation regarding its registration or use.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Pursuant to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted, in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove, on the balance of probabilities, each of the following elements:

- a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- c) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel addresses each element in turn.

### **Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Spanish. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Complainant is unable to communicate in Spanish and therefore, if the Complainant should submit all documents in Spanish, the proceedings will be unduly delayed, and the Complainant would have to incur substantial expenses for translation.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions \("WIPO Overview 3.1"\)](#), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

#### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the trademarks SODEXO and SODEXO LIVE ! through numerous national, regional, and international trademark registrations, all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark SODEXO in its entirety. The Panel also finds that the trademark SODEXO LIVE ! is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights for the purposes of the Policy. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the addition of the term "web" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. It is well established that where a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's trademark, the addition of dictionary, descriptive, or other terms does not avoid confusing similarity (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8).

The gTLD ".com" is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity analysis (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11).

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

#### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out circumstances by which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. While the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, once a prima facie case is established, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the SODEXO or SODEXO LIVE ! trademarks, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent holds any trademark or service mark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name.

On the contrary, the Registrar verification identifies the Respondent as "Jessica Martinez" associated with the name "Sodexo Libe" and an address corresponding to the headquarters of the Complainant's U.S. subsidiary. The Panel considers that the use of a name closely resembling the Complainant's corporate identity, together with the use of the Complainant's corporate address, strongly suggests impersonation and an attempt to create a false appearance of association with the Complainant. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and there is no evidence that it has been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is there any evidence of demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in a legitimate manner. The Panel notes that passive holding of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark does not, in itself, confer rights or legitimate interests.

Given the composition of the disputed domain name - incorporating the Complainant's trademarks together with the term "web" - the Panel finds that the disputed domain name carries a clear risk of implied affiliation. As reflected in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1, where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term that suggests sponsorship or endorsement, panels have found that such composition cannot constitute fair use.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is therefore satisfied.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may indicate that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Panels have consistently held that other circumstances, beyond those expressly listed, may also be relevant in assessing bad faith registration and use. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's SODEXO and SODEXO LIVE ! trademarks are long-established, highly distinctive, and widely known internationally, and they significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name in December 2025. In light of the global reputation and recognition of the Complainant's trademarks, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration.

The deliberate selection of a domain name that reproduces the Complainant's SODEXO LIVE ! trademark (minus the exclamation mark), combined with the term "web", strongly supports the conclusion that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "web" suggests an official online platform or digital interface associated with the Complainant's brand and reinforces the likelihood of confusion.

The Panel further notes that the term "sodexo" has no descriptive meaning and constitutes an inherently distinctive designation. Panels have repeatedly recognized the SODEXO trademark as well known for the purposes of the Policy. The high degree of distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark further supports the conclusion that the Respondent could not reasonably have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights.

The Panel also attaches particular significance to the Respondent's use of the name "Sodexo Libe" and an address corresponding to the headquarters of the Complainant's U.S. subsidiary. The provision of registration details closely resembling the Complainant's corporate identity strongly suggests impersonation and an attempt to create a false appearance of legitimacy. Panels have consistently held that impersonation and the use of misleading contact details constitute compelling evidence of bad faith registration and use.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive page provided by the Registrar, and it remains inactive. Although there is no evidence of active use, the Panel recalls that the absence of active use does not prevent a finding of bad faith. As established in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#), passive holding of a domain name may, in appropriate circumstances, constitute bad faith use. See also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the totality of the circumstances of this case, the Panel considers the following factors to be particularly relevant:

- (i) the high degree of distinctiveness and global reputation of the Complainant's trademarks;
- (ii) the reproduction of the Complainant's trademarks within the disputed domain name;
- (iii) the addition of a term ("web") suggesting an official online presence;
- (iv) the use of registration details mimicking the Complainant's corporate identity and address;
- (v) the overall implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put in light of the composition of the disputed domain name in relation to the Complainant's trademarks; and
- (vi) the Respondent's failure to submit any Response or to provide any explanation for the choice and registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the SODEXO trademark has been the subject of numerous prior UDRP proceedings in which panels have recognized its distinctive character and global reputation.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive trademarks together with the term "web", reinforcing the inference that the Respondent intentionally sought to create an appearance of official affiliation with the Complainant. This inference is further supported by the Respondent's use of registration details corresponding to the Complainant's U.S subsidiary, which strengthens the finding of deliberate targeting and bad faith.

In the Panel's view, any potential use of the disputed domain name would almost inevitably mislead Internet users and falsely imply affiliation with, endorsement by, or authorization from the Complainant.

The Respondent's failure to participate in the proceedings or to rebut the Complainant's allegations further reinforces the inference that the disputed domain name was registered and is being held in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <sodexoliveweb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Marcello Do Nascimento/*

**Marcello Do Nascimento**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 26, 2026