ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
SOGERES v. toni serge olivier
Case No. D2026-2100

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is toni serge olivier, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sogerescorporate.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 15, 2026. On May 18, 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, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 22, 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 June 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on June 29, 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 provider of food and corporate catering services, founded in 1934 and operating in the corporate and administrative, education, and healthcare sectors. The Complainant is part of the Sodexo group and operates approximately 960 restaurants.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for SOGERES (the "SOGERES Trademarks"), including the following:

- The French word trademark SOGERES, No. 1667699, registered on May 28, 1991, for goods and services in Classes 21, 29, 30, 35, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 45;

- The French word and device trademark sOgeres , No. 4475452, registered on August 9, 2018, for goods and services in Classes 29, 30, 35, 41, 43, and 44; and

- The European Union word trademark SOGERES, No. 012627261, registered on July 21, 2014, for goods and services in Classes 21, 29, 30, 35, 39, 41, 43, 44, and 45.

The Complainant also owns several domain names corresponding to or incorporating the SOGERES Trademarks, including <sogeres.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 7, 2026, and resolves to an inactive webpage.

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 SOGERES Trademarks, as it incorporates the mark SOGERES in its entirety. According to the Complainant, the addition of the term "corporate" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademarks.

The Complainant argues that Internet users are likely to assume that the disputed domain name is owned, operated, or otherwise associated with the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In particular, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and does not hold any prior rights in the term "sogeres" as a company name, trade name, business identifier, trademark, or domain name. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant and has never been authorized or otherwise permitted to register or use a domain name incorporating the SOGERES Trademarks.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that "sogeres" is a distinctive term with no apparent meaning other than as a reference to the Complainant and its SOGERES Trademarks. According to the Complainant, the Respondent was necessarily aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name and sought to take advantage of the reputation associated with the SOGERES

Trademarks. The Complainant further notes that, although the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. The Complainant also points out that the Respondent is involved in other domain name disputes concerning the Complainant's group, including proceedings relating to domain names incorporating the SODEXO and SOGERES Trademarks.

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "corporate", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 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.

In particular, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized by the Complainant to use the SOGERES Trademarks or to register a domain name incorporating them. Nor is there any indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the term "sogeres".

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 disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's SOGERES Trademark together with the term "corporate". The Panel considers it unlikely that the Respondent selected this combination independently of the Complainant, particularly given the distinctive nature of the SOGERES Trademarks and their connection with the Complainant's business activities. In these circumstances, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SOGERES Trademarks rights when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive webpage. Having regard in particular to the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's SOGERES Trademark in its entirety, the Respondent's apparent awareness of the Complainant and its trademark rights, the Respondent's failure to participate in these proceedings, and the circumstances noted above, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel also takes into account that the Respondent has been involved in other domain name disputes relating to domain names incorporating trademarks associated with the Complainant and its corporate group. This includes proceedings concerning the domain names <sodexo-distribution.com> and <sogeres-distributions.eu> (*Sodexo v. toni serge Olivier*, WIPO Case No. D2026-1798, and *SOGERES v. toni serge olivier*, WIPO Case No. DEU2026-0020, respectively), both of which reproduce trademarks of the Complainant's group. Although these circumstances are not conclusive in themselves, they may be indicative of a broader pattern of conduct targeting trademarks associated with the Complainant's corporate group and lend further support to the Panel's finding of bad faith.

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. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent's failure to submit a response, 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.

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 <sogerescorporate.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/
Christiane Féral-Schuhl
Sole Panelist
Date: July 13, 2026