

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. nicol nicol
Case No. D2026-1661

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is nicol nicol, Israel.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 20, 2026. On April 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 20, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 21, 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 22, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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 that was founded in 1966 and specializes in food services and facilities management. They employ more than 426,000 people, while daily serving 80 million consumers in 43 countries. For fiscal year 2025, their consolidated revenues reached EUR 24.1 billion. From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the SODEXHO mark and trade name. In 2008, the Complainant simplified the spelling of its mark and name to SODEXO, as well as changing its logo. The Complainant offers a wide range of services, including on-site services related to food services and facility management services, through numerous domain names, including at <sodexo.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for SODEXO, including the following:

- SODEXO (figurative), International trademark registration No. 964615, registered January 8, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, protected in numerous countries, including Israel;
- SODEXO, EUIPO trademark registration No. 008346462, registered February 1, 2010, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45;
- SODEXO (figurative), EUIPO trademark registration No. 006104657, registered June 27, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45.

In addition to the Complainant's above listed domain name and registered marks, the Complainant has a presence in Israel, where the Respondent is located, including through its domain name <sodexo.co.il>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on April 13, 2026, and pointed to a page connecting to a security notice warning that the site was used for phishing. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any 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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's SODEXO mark. The disputed domain name is composed of the Complainant's SODEXO mark in its entirety, with the addition of the letter G at the end. The addition of the final letter G is inoperative to distinguish the disputed domain name from the SODEXO mark, as the Complainant's mark is dominant and keeps its individuality and attractive character. The disputed domain name corresponds to a typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name. Given the identical reproduction of the SODEXO mark in the disputed domain name, the public will believe that the disputed domain name comes from the Complainant or is linked to the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no rights on SODEXO as a corporate name, trade name, shop sign, mark or domain name that would be prior to the Complainant's rights on SODEXO. 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 mark SODEXO/SODEXHO.

Additionally, 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.

Lastly, the Complainant avers that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The sign SODEXO 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 mark. Given the well-known character and reputation of the Complainant's mark, the Respondent obviously knew of its existence when registering the disputed domain name so that she knew that she had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that she could not lawfully use it.

The use of the Complainant's trademark for a domain name to point to a malicious website or page constitutes evidence of bad faith use of the disputed domain name. Such use tarnishes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's mark and demonstrates the Respondent's bad faith. Internet users who have a legitimate interest in the Complainant's services could have been exposed to a malicious website linked to the disputed domain name. The use of a domain name for spreading viruses may contribute to prove bad faith. The unauthorized use and registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent to attract and redirect Internet users to a malicious page are necessarily for the purpose of harming and/or achieving commercial gain and constitute 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 SODEXO 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. In the present case, the disputed domain name merely adds a "g" after the mark. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark, including an obvious or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting, is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. The Respondent's intentional misspelling of the SODEXO mark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as attempted phishing, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant acquired rights in its distinctive and widely-known SODEXO mark, including in the Respondent’s location of Israel. The disputed domain name is a typo of the Complainant’s mark, merely adding a “g” after “sodexo”. When attempting to access the website at the disputed domain name, the Complainant provided evidence of receiving a warning of the site being used for phishing.

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 disputed domain name is comprised of a typo of the Complainant’s well-known SODEXO mark, with just the addition of the letter “g”, and creates the unrebutted presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4; *Sodexo v. Roy Adams, Abtek*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5223](#).

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. These circumstances include, as in the instant case, the disputed domain name being a typo of a widely-known mark, the clear absence of the Respondent’s own rights and legitimate interests, the use of incomplete contact details in an attempt to hide the Respondent’s identity, and the failure to submit a response.

Additionally, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed to be attempted phishing, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <sodexog.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gary Saposnik/

Gary Saposnik

Sole Panelist

Date: June 1, 2026