

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compass Group Holdings PLC v. Edouard Albertini
Case No. D2026-1521

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Compass Group Holdings PLC, United Kingdom, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Edouard Albertini, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <compassfrance-group.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 April 10, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 12, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 14, 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 April 24, 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 April 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Tobias Malte Müller as the sole panelist in this matter on May 28, 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

It results from the Complainant's documented allegation that it has been established in 1984 and is now one of the world's largest contract food service and support services company. Headquartered in the United Kingdom, the Complainant has recorded revenue of USD 41,1 billion and over 590.000 employees operating in over 25 countries.

The Complaint is based amongst others on the following trademarks:

- (i) European Union trademark registration No. 000209197 for COMPASS (verbal), filed on April 1, 1996, and registered on June 1, 2001, for goods and services in classes 30, 32, 42;
- (ii) United States of America ("USA") trademark registration No. 2014461 for COMPASS GROUP (figurative), filed on March 13, 1995, registered on November 5, 1996.

These trademarks have duly been renewed and are in force.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 26, 2025. It currently resolves to a Registrar parking page with no active content. In addition, active MX records have been set up for the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Respondent has ignored the Complainant's three warning letters sent through the Registrar's contact form on January 16 and 24, 2026 and February 2, 2026, respectively and aiming to resolve this dispute outside of these administrative proceedings.

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:

- (i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark COMPASS and COMPASS GROUP since the Respondent has added the geographical term "France" to these marks. Furthermore, the addition of a hyphen in between the terms comprising the Complainant's COMPASS GROUP trademark does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademarks;
- (ii) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, there is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate noncommercial use. In particular, the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its marks. The Respondent is also not a licensee of the Complainant's marks;

(iii) the disputed domain name can only be taken as intending to cause confusion among Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name, and thus, it must be considered as having been registered and used in bad faith. In addition, the disputed domain name has active MX records, which could potentially be used for phishing purposes. The Respondent has ignored the Complainant's attempts to resolve this dispute outside of this administrative proceeding. Finally, on balance of the facts set forth above, it is more likely than not that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant's trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

- (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.

The Panel is satisfied that the registrant of record for the disputed domain name is the Respondent and will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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, i.e. registered trademarks COMPASS and COMPASS GROUP in the European Union and the USA respectively.

The entirety of these marks is reproduced within the disputed domain name. It is merely combined with the additional elements "france-" which is a mere geographic indication and a hyphen. The Panel therefore finds the marks are clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other elements, here, "France-", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements 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 disputed domain name resolves to a commercial provider parking page. This Panel is of the opinion that such use does neither represent a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name giving rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names under paragraph 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy. In particular, the Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use any of its trademarks in any way.

In addition, the disputed domain name contains the Complainant’s trademarks COMPASS and COMPASS GROUP with the term “France”, so that this Panel finds it most likely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name with the intention to take advantage of the Complainant’s registered trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that there is no evidence in the record that could lead to the conclusion that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. In addition, the Respondent does not appear to have any connection or affiliation with the Complainant.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar parking page without genuine, active content. With comparative reference to the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP deemed to establish bad faith registration and use, prior UDRP panels have found that the apparent lack of active use (*e.g.*, to resolve to a website) of the domain name without any active attempt to sell or to contact the trademark holder (passive holding), does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding (see, *e.g.* *Caffè Borbone S.r.l. v. Manlidy, GNN*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1095](#)). The Panel must therefore examine all the circumstances of the case to determine

whether the Respondent is acting in bad faith. Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include:

- (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark;
- (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use;
- (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity; or
- (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement).

(see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3).

In the case at hand, the Panel considers the following circumstances surrounding the registration and use as suggesting that the Respondent was aware that it has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith:

- (i) the intrinsic distinctiveness of the trademarks which (a) have existed for decades, (b) which are part of the Complainant's company name and tradename;
- (ii) the composition of the disputed domain name, including two of the Complainant's trademarks identically and thus carries a high risk of implied affiliation;
- (iii) the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint and bring forward any plausible arguments for a plausible legitimate active use that the Respondent could make of the disputed domain name;
- (iv) the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's three warning letters attempting to resolve this dispute outside of this administrative proceedings; and
- (v) the fact that the disputed domain name has been connected to active MX records so that the Respondent could be engaged in a phishing scheme.

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 <compassfrance-group.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Malte Müller/

Tobias Malte Müller

Sole Panelist

Date: June 11, 2026