

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Michael London

Case No. D2026-1666

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Michael London, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sorexo.shop> is registered with Spaceship, 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 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 Xu Lin as the sole panelist in this matter on May 20, 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, created in 1966, is a French company specialized in food services and facilities management. From 1966, the Complainant's business was promoted as SODEXHO, which was changed to SODEXO in 2008.

The Complainant owns numerous SODEXO and SODEXHO trademark registrations ("SODEXO / SODEXHO Trademarks") around the world, including the following:

- International Trademark No. 964615 for SODEXO (design), registered on January 8, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, protected in multiple jurisdictions including the United States;
- United States Trademark No. 3722463 for SODEXO (design), registered on December 8, 2009, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45;
- European Union Trademark No. 008346462 for SODEXO, registered on February 1, 2010, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45; and
- International Trademark No. 694302 for SODEXHO (design), registered on June 22, 1998, in international class 9, protected in multiple jurisdictions.

The domain name <sodexo.com> resolves to the Complainant's official website promoting its services. The Complainant also owns numerous domain names corresponding to and/or containing Sodexo, which, among others, include the following: <us.sodexo.com>, <sodexo.fr>, and <sodexoca.com>.

The Respondent is reportedly based in the United States.

The disputed domain name <sorex.shop> was registered on April 9, 2026, and currently 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:

Firstly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the SODEXO / SODEXHO Trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

- The SODEXO / SODEXHO Trademarks have a strong reputation and are widely known all over the world. Previous UDRP decisions already recognized the well-known character of the SODEXO / SODEXHO Trademarks.
- In the disputed domain name, the sign SOREXO is almost identical to the mark and company name SODEXO. The only difference between the signs is the substitution of the consonant D for R. On a keyboard, the letter R is placed right above the letter D. Such a difference corresponds to an obvious misspelling of the mark SODEXO which can be made by an Internet user and is characteristic of typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain name.

- The generic Top-Level Domain “.shop” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and, as such, is disregarded to assess the identity or similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademarks.
- The disputed domain name does not currently connect to an active website. The Complainant, which has recently faced several attacks, strongly fears a fraudulent use of the disputed domain name for phishing.

Secondly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

- The Respondent is unknown to the Complainant, and does not have any affiliation, association, sponsorship or connection with the Complainant. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant or any of its subsidiaries or affiliated companies to register the disputed domain name and to use it.
- The Respondent has no rights on SODEXO as 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 of SODEXO / SODEXHO by the Complainant as its corporate name, business name and trademarks.

Finally, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

- The SODEXO mark is purely fanciful and nobody could legitimately choose this word or any variation thereof, unless seeking to create an association with the SODEXO trademark and activities.
- Given the well-known character of the SODEXO / SODEXHO Trademarks, the Respondent obviously knew its existence when he registered the disputed domain name. Previous UDRP decisions already recognize that actual knowledge of the Complainant’s trademarks and activities at the time of registration of the disputed domain name may be considered an inference of bad faith.
- It is very likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to create confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks to divert or mislead third parties for illegitimate profit.
- The fact that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive web page does not prevent a finding of bad faith. Factors considered when applying the passive holding doctrine include, among others, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use.
- The unauthorized registration of the disputed domain name and its (seemingly) passive holding, likely in the aim of fraudulent use, are for the purpose of commercial gain.

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 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 Panel finds the substitution of the letter “R” for the letter “D” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark SODEXO for the purposes of the Policy. The disputed domain name consists of a variation of the trademark SODEXO while sufficiently recognizable aspects remain despite the letter substitution. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

In what concerns the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain “.shop” in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 has not granted any license or right to the Respondent to use its trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The evidence submitted by the Complainant indicates that the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive web page. The Respondent’s passive holding of the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s SODEXO trademark cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests onto the Respondent in the disputed domain name under the circumstances of the case.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name consists of a common, obvious, or intentional variation of the Complainant’s SODEXO trademark in which the letter “D” is replaced by “R”. Internet users may not notice such a subtle difference which signals an intention on the part of the Respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant.

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, given the distinctiveness and strong reputation of the SODEXO trademark, the Panel finds it highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks.

The Respondent has provided no explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name, nor is there any apparent legitimate reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the famous SODEXO mark, other than to exploit the value and reputation of the SODEXO mark.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the lack of a response from the Respondent, 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. In addition, the disputed domain name is a typographical variant of the Complainant's mark, which constitutes typosquatting, further supporting a finding of bad faith.

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 <sorex.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Xu Lin/

Xu Lin

Sole Panelist

Date: May 24, 2026