

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Rajib Singh
Case No. D2026-0766

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Rajib Singh, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hroptsodexo.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 23, 2026. On February 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 25, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 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 March 2, 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 March 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Christelle Vaval as the sole panelist in this matter on April 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 established in 1966. The Complainant is one of the leading companies in the world, specializing in food services and facilities management, with more than 426,000 employees serving 80 million consumers across 43 countries.

The Complainant owns the trademark and logo SODEXO in multiple jurisdictions, including:

- International Registration No. 1240316 (registered on October 23, 2014); and
- India Trademark Registration No. 1635770 (combined) (registered on December 28, 2007).

The Complainant owns multiple domain names including <sodexo.com>, <sodexoca.com>, <sodexousa.com>, and <sodexo.fr>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 20, 2026, well after the Complainant's trademarks were registered. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

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 its trademarks SODEXO. The disputed domain name incorporates the SODEXO trademark in its entirety. The addition of the terms "hr" and "opt" does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark.
- The Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name and has no affiliation, sponsorship, or authorization from the Complainant to use its SODEXO trademark.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent likely registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's SODEXO mark. The passive holding of the disputed domain name, with the lack of legitimate use and the strong reputation of the Complainant's trademark, constitutes bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "hr" and "opt" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Considering the Complainant's rights to the SODEXO mark and the fact that the disputed domain name fully reproduces this trademark, the Panel concludes that there is a confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

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 disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and appears to be passively held. According to the record, the Respondent has no affiliation, sponsorship, or authorization from the Complainant to use its trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been known by the disputed domain name. Further, the Panel finds the disputed domain name misleadingly implies an association with the Complainant's trademark (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the SODEXO trademark is highly distinctive, it is a unique term created by the Complainant with no inherent meaning that enjoys a strong reputation and recognition globally. The Panel further finds that adding the terms “hr” and “opt” before the SODEXO trademark in the disputed domain name (with the term “hr” being a known acronym for “human resources” and the term “opt”, as alleged by the Complainant, could stand for “optimization”) is prone to create confusion among Internet users as to its affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and lack of response, 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 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 <hroptsodexo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christelle Vaval/

Christelle Vaval

Sole Panelist

Date: April 16, 2026