ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
SODEXO v. Status 77, Status77
Case No. D2026-1240

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Status 77, Status77, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexosurveys.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") 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 23, 2026. On March 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On March 23, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 25, 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 30, 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 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Mariia Koval 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, founded in 1966, is the French company and is one of the largest companies in the world specialized in food services and facilities management, with more than 426,000 employees serving daily 80 million consumers in 43 countries. For fiscal year 2025, consolidated revenues of the Complainant reached EUR 24.1 billion which represent by region: 46% North America, 36 % Europe, and 18 % for the rest of the world.

The Complainant is the owner of many SODEXO and SODEXHO trademark registrations (collectively the "SODEXO Trademarks") in various jurisdictions worldwide, among which are:

- International Trademark Registration No. 689106 for SODEXHO, registered on January 28, 1998, in classes 16, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42;
- International Trademark Registration No. 964615 for SODEXO, registered on January 1, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 008346462 for SODEXO, registered on February 1, 2010, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45.

The Complainant has built up a considerable online presence and is operating, among others, the domain name <sodexo.com>, where the SODEXO Trademark is prominently used and promoted. The Complainant has also made substantial investments to develop a strong presence online by being active on various social media platforms.

The Complainant has provided evidence that previous UDRP panels have determined the SODEXO Trademarks as being well known. See *Sodexo v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico*, WIPO Case No. D2020-1580 ("Further, the Complainant's business is truly international and of such a size and scope that it has developed a very substantial reputation and goodwill as has been recognized by previous UDRP panels."); *SODEXO v. Ashutosh Dwivedi, Food & Beverages*, WIPO Case No. D2020-2686 ("The Mark is sufficiently distinctive and well-known such that it is difficult to conceive of any use that the Respondent might make of the disputed domain name without the Complainant's consent that would not involve bad faith."); *Sodexo v. Yang Zhichao (杨智超)*, WIPO Case No. D2021-0902 ("In this case, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's famous SODEXO mark plus the descriptive words 'rewards' and 'hub' that are related to the Complainant's benefits and rewards services, thus, creating a presumption of bad faith.")

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 4, 2009. As at the date of issuing this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name redirects to different parked webpages, either containing different Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") links to third-party websites or various information (news, articles, etc.). As at the date of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name redirected to a webpage connecting to a malicious website (Annex 13 to the Complaint).

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks since the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks in their entirety with the addition of the term "surveys".

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name in view of the following:

- the Respondent has no rights in SODEXO as corporate name, trade name, shop sign, mark or domain name that would be prior to the Complainant's rights on SODEXO Trademarks;
- the Respondent was not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name prior to the adoption and use by the Complainant of the corporate name, business name and SODEXO Trademarks;
- the Respondent does not have any affiliation, association, sponsorship or connection with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant or by any subsidiary or affiliated company to register the Disputed Domain Name and to use it.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith based on the following. The SODEXO Trademarks are 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 SODEXO Trademarks. Given the well-known character and reputation of the SODEXO Trademarks since many years, the Respondent obviously knew its existence when it registered the Disputed Domain Name, so that it perfectly knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and that it cannot lawfully use it.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the use of the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks for the Disputed Domain Name to point to a malicious website or page constitutes evidence of bad faith use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant to succeed must satisfy 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 was 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 Disputed Domain Name completely reproduces the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks in combination with the additional term "surveys" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". According to the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The addition of the term "surveys" to the SODEXO Trademarks does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity in this case.
According to the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1, the applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 concludes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's right over the Disputed Domain Name under the Policy, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Also, in accordance with the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1, even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The composition of the Disputed Domain Name – reproducing the entirety of the SODEXO Trademarks, along with the term "surveys" – carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The fact that the Respondent has incorporated the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks in their entirety in the Disputed Domain Name is further evidence, that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name and has done so for the purpose of creating an impression that the Disputed Domain Name is connected with the Complainant.

The Panel is of opinion that there is no evidence that the Respondent has used and is using the Disputed Domain Name to offer bona fide goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. On the contrary, as of the date of this Decision the Disputed Domain Name redirects either to different webpages containing PPC links to the third parties websites or to other different websites. In accordance with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9, panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page

comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. Moreover, according to the evidence presented by the Complainant, the Respondent previously used the Disputed Domain Name for redirection to the malicious website where a notification appears stating, "your computer might currently be under virus threat". In pursuance of WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1, "Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals, phishing/identity theft, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent". Therefore, such previous and current use of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Respondent did not file any Response to the Complaint and did not participate in this proceeding, as such, the Respondent did not present any evidence for supporting any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and that the Complainant succeeds under the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith in view of the following. The Complainant obtained the registrations of the SODEXO Trademarks more than 10 years earlier than the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in 2009. Taking into account all circumstances of this case and worldwide fame of the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks, the Panel finds that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant's business and its SODEXO Trademarks when registering the confusingly similar Disputed Domain Name that completely incorporates the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks and company name, with the addition of the word "surveys". The Panel considers it is in bad faith that the Respondent, more likely than not, deliberately chose the Disputed Domain Name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SODEXO Trademarks, so as to create a false association or affiliation with the Complainant.

At the date of this Decision, when accessed by the Panel, the Disputed Domain Name redirects either to the website containing PPC links or other different websites. The Complainant also provided the evidence that the Disputed Domain Name previously resolved to a page with safety warning. Such use of the Disputed Domain Name obviously cannot constitute good faith.

According to section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, UDRP 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. The Panel is of the opinion that it is highly likely that the Respondent, having registered and used the Disputed Domain Name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known SODEXO Trademarks, intended to disrupt the Complainant's business and confuse Internet users seeking or expecting the Complainant's website. In view of the absence of any evidence to the contrary and the fact that the Respondent did not file any Response to claim otherwise, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Panel considers that, taking into account all circumstances of this case, the Respondent's use of privacy service also constitutes further evidence of bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied by the Complainant and accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <sodexosurveys.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mariia Koval/
Mariia Koval
Sole Panelist
Date: May 18, 2026