ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Sodexo v. Rocky Tossú
Case No. D2026-0279

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Rocky Tossú, Greece.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexosports.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 23, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 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 28, 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 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 in this proceeding is Sodexo, a French company. Founded in 1966, the Complainant (formerly known as Sodexho Alliance) is one of the largest companies in the world specializing in food services and facilities management, with 426,000 employees serving 80 million consumers daily in 43 countries. The Complainant is one of the world's largest employers. From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the SODEXHO trademark and trade name. In 2008, the Complainant simplified the spelling of its trademark and trade name to SODEXO.

The Complainant owns the SODEXO and SODEXHO trademarks, which enjoy protection through many registrations worldwide.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

- International Trademark Registration number 964615 for the SODEXO (device) trademark, registered on January 8, 2008;
- European Union Trade Mark registration number 008346462 for the SODEXO (word) trademark registered on February 1, 2010; and
- International Trademark Registration number 689106 for the SODEXHO (device) trademark, registered on January 28, 1998.

The Complainant also claims that it owns numerous domain names corresponding to and/or containing the SODEXO trademark. The Complainant's group promotes its activities among others under the following domain names: <sodexo.com>, <uk.sodexo.com>, <sodexoprestige.co.uk>, <sodexo.fr>, <sodexoca.com>, <sodexousa.com>, <cn.sodexo.com>, <sodexho.fr>, and <sodexho.com>.

Numerous prior UDRP panels have concluded that the SODEXO mark is well known across the world.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 18, 2026.

Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website. Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, it appears that, at least as of January 23, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a website purportedly offering various third party products for sale, particularly sports-related products.

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 SODEXO trademark is purely fanciful and nobody could legitimately choose this word or any variation thereof, unless seeking to create an association with the Complainant's activities and the SODEXO trademark. Therefore, given the well-known character and reputation of the SODEXO and SODEXHO trademarks, the Respondent knew of the marks' existence when he registered the disputed domain name, so that he perfectly knew that he had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that he cannot lawfully use it.

Furthermore, the Complainant submits that there is a risk of fraudulent use of the disputed domain name, in particular for the purpose of sending emails to, and obtaining payments from, the Complainant's clients from an email address associated with the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
(iii) 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 Select UDRP Questions ("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.

The Panel finds the mark is incorporated entirely and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "sports", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

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 that 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 3.1, 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 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.

The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant's trademark was registered. In addition, owing to the substantial presence established worldwide and on the Internet by the Complainant, it is at the least very unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

Prior UDRP panels have repeatedly recognized the strength and renown of the Complainant's SODEXO and SODEXHO trademarks.

Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, had knowledge of the Complainant's earlier rights to the SODEXO and SODEXHO trademarks.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website offering goods for sale, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Inference of bad faith can also be found in the failure to respond to the Complainant's contentions, and the Respondent's lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <sodexosports.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/
Fabrizio Bedarida
Sole Panelist
Date: February 27, 2026