

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Domain Admin, TotalDomain Privacy Ltd
Case No. D2026-2094

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Admin, TotalDomain Privacy Ltd, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexo.org> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 15, 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 16, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 18, 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 21, 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 June 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on July 10, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a French company founded in 1966, being one of the largest companies in the world specialized in food services and facilities management, with 426,000 employees serving daily 80 million consumers in 43 countries. For the fiscal year 2025, the Complainant's consolidated revenues reached EUR 24.1 billion which represent by region: 46% North America, 36% Europe, and 18% for the rest of the world. The Complainant's trademark SODEXO is used in connection with various services in the field of food services and facility management services. From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the SODEXHO mark and trade name, and in 2008 it simplified the spelling of its mark and name to SODEXO.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of various trademarks relating to its company name and brands SODEXO and SODEXHO, including, but not limited to the following:

- French trademark SODEXHO, No. 1249935, registered on November 4, 1983, and last renewed in 2023, in classes 5, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 43, and 45;
- International Trademark SODEXHO (figurative), No. 689106 registered on January 28, 1998, and last renewed in 2018, in classes 16, 36, 37, 39, 41, and 42; and
- International Trademark SODEXO (figurative), No. 964615, filed and registered on January 8, 2008, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, duly renewed.

The Complainant has been the owner of the domain name <sodexo.com> since 1998, which it uses for its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 1, 2001, and according to information with the Complaint it has been used at least recently to redirect Internet users to a webpage that purports to display a series of virus alerts in French. Consumers are then incited to click on "Démarrer Avast Premium Security" (in English "Launch Avast Premium Security"). The Complainant has also filed evidence showing that it previously resolved to a page displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") links, including a link to "Food Coupons".

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 almost identical to the prior trademark of the Complainant, SODEXHO, the only difference being the deletion of the letter "h", otherwise the disputed domain name is phonetically identical and visually highly similar to it. Such a difference corresponds to an obvious misspelling of the SODEXHO mark which can be made by an Internet user and is characteristic of typosquatting practice. In addition, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark SODEXO.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that 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 disputed domain name is used to redirect Internet users to a webpage displaying a series of virus alerts in French and prompting the user to immediately buy an antivirus program by pretending that the computer is no longer protected. In the past, the disputed domain name did not link to any content, or it resolved to a parked page.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant argues that its trademark SODEXHO is purely fanciful and nobody could legitimately choose this term or any variation thereof, unless seeking to create an association with the Complainant's activities and mark SODEXHO. Given the well-known character and reputation of the SODEXHO and SODEXO marks for many years, the Respondent obviously knew the existence of these marks 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.

Regarding the use, the Complainant submits that the unauthorized use and registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent to attract and redirect Internet users to a tech scam are necessarily for the purpose of harming and/or achieving financial gain and then constitute bad faith registration and use. Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the details held and disclosed by the Registrar for the disputed domain name show that an additional privacy service was used by the registrant to hide its identity. This "Russian doll" scenario is another indicator of bad faith. Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent was already involved in other cases of tech scam with domain names it registered reproducing marks owned by third parties, and where the panels ordered the transfer of the relevant disputed domain names to the complainant.

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". Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that "the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence".

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 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 mark SODEXO is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Further, the Panel finds the Complainant's SODEXHO 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](#), sections 1.7, 1.9.

It is the settled view of panels applying the Policy that the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") (here ".org") may be disregarded under the first element test. See [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 contended that its trademark is well known, registered in a variety of jurisdictions around the world and provided evidence of its reputation. The Complainant also provided evidence which shows that the disputed domain name was used for tech support scam, alerting users that their computer has been infected with a virus. The Panel considers these as sufficient prima facie evidence of illegal activity, all the more, since the Respondent did neither submit any explanations nor comments on this evidence.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed malware or tech support scam) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. Nor is the prior use to display PPC links, some of which are related to the Complainant, bona fide in the circumstances of this case.

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.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark by an unaffiliated entity (as it is in the present case) can by itself create a presumption of bad faith, particularly in case of domain names comprising typos. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. The disputed domain name consists of a common and obvious misspelling of the Complainant's prior trademark SODEXHO, since it only removes the "h" in the Complainant's trademark. It is also identical to the then registered domain name of the Complainant, <sodexo.com>, apart from the gTLD. Further, it is inconceivable that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights; this is especially supported by the fact that the Complainant has a strong Internet presence, and the Complainant had registered rights in the mark SODEXHO before the registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, it appears from the Complainant's documented allegations in the past the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying PPC links also in the Complainant's area of activity. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant's mark. The Panel is therefore convinced that the disputed domain name was registered with full knowledge of the Complainant's rights and as such in bad faith by the Respondent.

As regards the use, according to the unrebutted evidence filed with the Complaint, the disputed domain name was used to display a page with PPC advertisement links and later redirect Internet users to a webpage displaying a series of virus alerts. Consumers are then incited to click on "Démarrer Avast Premium Security" (in English "Launch Avast Premium Security") to try to solve the problem. This Panel considers these as sufficient prima facie evidence of illegal activity, all the more, since the Respondent did neither submit any explanations nor comments on these assertions. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed malware or tech support scam) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Also, there appears to be a pattern of abusive registrations by the Respondent, as the unrebutted evidence shows that the Respondent was involved in previous UDRP proceedings where similar facts caused the concerned UDRP panels to decide in favor of the relevant complainant (see *APICIL TRANSVERSE v. Domain Admin, TotalDomain Privacy Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5051](#); *Equifax Inc. v. Domain Admin, TotalDomain Privacy Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2313](#); *Equifax Inc. v. Domain Admin, TotalDomain Privacy Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1807](#)). This fact also supports a finding grounded on paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, referring to a respondent registering "the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct".

In the Panel's view, the circumstances of the case represent evidence of registration and use in bad faith of the disputed domain name. The Respondent failed to bring evidence to the contrary. Consequently, the Panel concludes that the condition of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is fulfilled.

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 <sodexo.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: July 20, 2026