

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

SODEXO v. Vlad Oleg  
Case No. D2026-0132

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Vlad Oleg, Belgium.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <ionzlodisodexo.info> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 13, 2026. On January 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On January 15, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the 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 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 16, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on February 19, 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. It is one of the largest companies in the world specialising in food services and facilities management. It has more than 426,000 employees serving 80 million consumers daily in 43 countries. The Complainant's consolidated revenues for fiscal year 2025 reached EUR 24.1 billion.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a number of registered trademarks in respect of SODEXO around the world, including European Union trademark number 008346462 SODEXO registered on February 1, 2010; and International trademark number 964615 stylized wordmark SODEXO registered on January 8, 2008, designating a number of territories including the European Union and Egypt.

The Complainant operates websites under a number of domain names, including <sodexo.be> where it promotes its services to Internet users in Belgium where the Respondent is located.

The Domain Name was registered on January 11, 2026. It resolves to a website purporting to promote the services of an interior design organisation based in Cairo, Egypt. The home page has the bold title "Cairo Chic Design Dreams" but it is not clear whether this is the name of the organisation. The "Projects" tab on the banner menu links to an "About Us" section which simply states "Cairo's Creative Core. We're a passionate collective of designers...". The "About" tab on the banner menu links to a section referring to dates in 2023 and 2024 with apparently illogical headings and bullet points. The "Book Now" button at the top of the home page links to a photograph of a fireplace. The website gives no information as to the operator of the website and the contact details at the foot of the home page comprise what appears to be a mobile telephone number in Egypt and an address in Cairo which, based on the Panel's search using Google, does not appear to exist.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its SODEXO trademark (the "Mark"), that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the 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 respect of the Domain Name; and

(iii) the 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 Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".info", the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the term "ionzlodi". The Panel finds that the addition of the apparently meaningless term "ionzlodi" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has made out a strong prima facie case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website purporting to promote the services of a Cairo based interior design agency, but which has many features, as noted above, which indicate that the website is a spoof. It fails to give any information as to the operator of the website, contains a number of inconsistent links and meaningless text, as well as a contact address in Cairo, Egypt that appears not to exist.

Furthermore, there is no explanation on why such composition of the Domain Name would have a connection with a purported design business, as to explain the reason for such registration, and no explanation is apparent. The website does not make any mention of the terms comprising the Domain Name, whether "ionz" or "lodi" or "ionzlodi" or "sodexo". There is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the Domain Name, or by any of the terms comprising the Domain Name. The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complaint or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

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.

The Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark together with the apparently meaningless term “ionzlodi”. In light of the notoriety of the Mark and the absence of any explanation by the Respondent as to its reasons for registering a domain name incorporating the Mark, the Panel finds on balance that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel considers it difficult to conceive of any legitimate use to which the Respondent could put the Domain Name, incorporating as it does the entirety of the Mark. In the circumstances, the Panel finds on balance that the Respondent intended to mislead Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark, presumably for commercial gain. These factors support a finding of bad faith registration and use for the purposes of the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Accordingly, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 Domain Name <ionzlodisodexo.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Ian Lowe/*

**Ian Lowe**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 25, 2026