

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Gina Yu
Case No. D2026-2062

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Gina Yu, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexho.xyz> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 13, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 19, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 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 May 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 May 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Igor Alfiorov as the sole panelist in this matter on June 24, 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, SODEXO, founded in 1966 in France, is one of the world's largest companies specializing in food services and facilities management. It operates in 43 countries, employs over 426,000 people, and serves approximately 80 million consumers daily. For the fiscal year 2025, its consolidated revenues reached EUR 24.1 billion. From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant operated and promoted its business under the trade name and mark SODEXHO (previously "SODEXHO ALLIANCE"), simplifying the spelling of its marks, trade name, and logo to SODEXO in 2008.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for its SODEXO and SODEXHO marks, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 689106 for the combined mark SODEXHO, registered on January 28, 1998 in classes 16, 36, 37, 39, 41, and 42, designating multiple countries including the United States of America;
- International Trademark Registration No. 694302 for the combined mark SODEXHO, registered on June 22, 1998, in class 9;
- International Trademark Registration No. 964615 for the stylized mark SODEXO, registered on January 8, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 008346462 for the word mark SODEXO, registered on February 1, 2010.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names containing its trademarks, including <sodexo.com>, <sodexho.com>, <sodexo.fr>, and <sodexho.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 4, 2026. It currently (and at the time of filing of the Complaint) resolves to a parked page on "www.godaddy.com" offering the domain name for sale to the general public for USD 1,450.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <sodexho.xyz> is composed of the SODEXHO mark in its entirety and is confusingly similar to its registered mark SODEXO. The generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".xyz" should be disregarded for the comparison.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the domain name, has no prior rights in the name, and has never been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use its marks. The disputed domain name is parked and offered for sale for USD 1,450, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Third, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant's famous and distinctive marks. The Respondent's bad faith is evidenced by:

- Registering the domain name to sell it for USD 1,450, a sum far exceeding out-of-pocket registration costs;
- Employing a privacy service to conceal her identity; and
- Engaging in a pattern of registering domain names reproducing third-party marks, as shown by prior WIPO transfers ordered against her (e.g., <alfalaval.online> in *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Gina Yu*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1510](#) and <clarins.online> in *CLARINS v. Gina Yu*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0060](#)).

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 provided abundant evidence of its trademark registrations for both SODEXO and its historical spelling SODEXHO, registered decades before the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <sodexho.xyz> incorporates the Complainant's registered trademark SODEXHO in its entirety, and is thus identical to the trademark for purposes of the Policy.

The gTLD extension ".xyz" is viewed as a standard technical registration requirement and is disregarded under the confusing similarity test ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1).

Therefore, the Panel finds that 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.

The Complainant has established an un rebutted prima facie case: it has no relationship with the Respondent, has not authorized her to use its marks, and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a response to rebut the Complainant's assertions.

Moreover, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark, resolves to a parked page offering the domain name for sale for USD 1,450.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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.

Given the global fame and distinctiveness of the Complainant's SODEXO and SODEXHO marks, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The sign SODEXHO is a fanciful, coined term with no dictionary meaning, indicating that the Respondent registered the name to target the Complainant ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2).

As to bad faith registration and use, paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy states that registering a domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring it to the trademark owner or a competitor for valuable consideration likely in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs is evidence of bad faith. The Respondent has listed <sodexho.xyz>, which is identical to the Complainant's well-known trademark, for sale on GoDaddy for USD 1,450 ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1).

Furthermore, the Respondent has previously been found to have registered confusingly similar domain names targeting other well-known brands. This establishes a pattern of conduct of preventing trademark holders from reflecting their marks in domain names, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2). The initial use of a privacy service to hide the registrant's identity further supports this finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <sodexho.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Igor Alfiorov/

Igor Alfiorov

Sole Panelist

Date: July 8, 2026