

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Ivan Andropov, cpa

Case No. D2026-1119

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ivan Andropov, cpa, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sorexo.online> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 16, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 16, 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 (Domains By Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 19, 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 19, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 14, 2026. The Respondent sent several email communications to the Center between March 19 and March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not formally respond to the Complaint. The Center sent a possible settlement email to the Parties on March 25, 2026. On the same day, the Complainant indicated to the Respondent that if it would like to settle the dispute, it was invited to sign the Standard Settlement Form. The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s email. The Center

notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on April 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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.

Further email communications were received from the Respondent on May 18 and May 21, 2026, respectively.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a French multinational corporation specialising in food services and facilities management. Founded in 1966, the Complainant operates internationally and provides a broad range of on-site services, including catering, employee benefits, and facility management solutions. The Complainant operates in numerous jurisdictions worldwide. From 1966 to 2008, Complainant promoted its business under the SODEXHO mark and in 2008, Complainant simplified the spelling of its SODEXHO mark to SODEXO.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for SODEXO and SODEXHO in various jurisdictions, including, inter alia:

- International Registration No. 964615 for SODEXO, registered on January 8, 2008, including a designation of Ukraine;
- International Registration No. 1240316 for SODEXO, registered on October 23, 2014; and
- International Registration No. 694302 for SODEXHO, registered on June 22, 1998, including a designation of Ukraine.

The Complainant has also registered and uses domain names incorporating its SODEXO mark, including <sodexo.com>, which it uses in connection with its official website and online activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 12, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page simply stating that the disputed domain name has been “successfully parked”.

The Respondent is apparently an entity located in Ukraine. The record contains no further information regarding the Respondent.

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 to be a multinational corporation specialising in food services and facilities management, operating internationally under the trademarks SODEXO and SODEXHO. The Complainant submits that it owns numerous trademark registrations for SODEXO and SODEXHO in various jurisdictions worldwide, including trademark protection extending to Ukraine. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SODEXO trademark, as it consists of an obvious misspelling differing by only one letter. The Complainant further submits that such minor alteration is insufficient to avoid confusing similarity and constitutes a typical example of typosquatting. The Complainant also notes that, on a keyboard, the letter “r” is positioned directly above the letter “d”, which,

according to the Complainant, reinforces the typographical nature of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has not authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating them. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making any bona fide or legitimate noncommercial use of it. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page and submits that no rights or legitimate interests arise from such use. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration, given the distinctiveness and longstanding and international use of the SODEXO mark and the typographical nature of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also refers to the passive holding of the disputed domain name and submits that there is no plausible good-faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. In particular, the Respondent did not address the Complainant's assertions concerning confusing similarity, rights or legitimate interests, or bad faith.

The Respondent nevertheless sent informal email communications to the Center during the proceeding. In these communications, the Respondent appeared to express confusion regarding the nature of the proceeding, indicated that the disputed domain name had been "listed for sale", and ultimately stated that the Respondent did not wish to contest the proceeding and had no objection to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The record further reflects that the possibility of an amicable resolution was raised during the proceeding, but the matter was not resolved on that basis and no substantive explanation regarding the registration or use of the disputed domain name was ultimately provided by the Respondent. No formal procedural request or substantive filing was submitted by the Respondent.

After the panel appointment, on May 18 and May 21, 2026, respectively, the Respondent sent two email communications to the Center indicating it looked forward to receiving the decision, and "[p]lease take this domain away from me — I don't need it, and I'd like to give it up".

6. Discussion and Findings

Procedural Issue: Location of the Respondent

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Since the Respondent's mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The Panel notes that the Center sent the Notification of Complaint by email to the Respondent at its email address as registered with the Registrar and to a postmaster email address as specified by the Rules. The records indicate that the notification email was sent to the Registrar-confirmed email address of the Respondent. Furthermore, several email communications have been received from the Respondent during the proceeding.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

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 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain name incorporates an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's SODEXO mark, differing by only one letter. The Panel finds that the SODEXO mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Such minor alteration is characteristic of typosquatting and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy.

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 Complainant states that it has not authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the SODEXO mark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. There is also no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name consists of an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's distinctive SODEXO mark and resolves to a parked page simply indicating that the disputed domain name has been "successfully parked". The record does not indicate any active use of the disputed domain name beyond the parked page, nor any circumstances capable of supporting rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent.

The Panel further notes that, although the Respondent participated in the proceeding through several informal email communications, the Respondent did not provide any substantive explanation regarding the registration or intended use of the disputed domain name, nor did the Respondent articulate any basis upon

which rights or legitimate interests could be claimed.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which consists of an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's distinctive SODEXO mark, differing by only a single letter. The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant obtained trademark rights in SODEXO and SODEXHO, including trademark protection extending to Ukraine, where the Respondent is apparently located according to the Registrar's disclosure.

Having regard to the distinctive nature of the Complainant's marks, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the circumstances reflected in the record, the Panel finds it implausible that the disputed domain name was selected independently or by coincidence. In particular, the record discloses no plausible explanation for the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name independent of the Complainant's marks. In the absence of any substantive explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds it reasonable to infer that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration.

The Panel also notes that, during the proceeding, the Respondent sent informal communications stating that the disputed domain name had been "listed for sale", and subsequently indicated that the Respondent did not wish to contest the proceeding and had no objection to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. While these communications are not determinative by themselves, they do not provide any substantive explanation for the Respondent's registration or intended use of 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 (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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 <sorexonline> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: May 25, 2026