

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Alicia Farrow, Arzon Development
Case No. D2026-2389

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Alicia Farrow, Arzon Development, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sosdexo.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 2, 2026. On June 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On June 3, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 4, 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 the amended Complaint on the same day.

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 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 was founded in 1966 and is one of the largest companies in the world specialized in food services and facilities management. The Complainant is one of the largest employers worldwide, employing over 426,000 people serving daily 80 million consumers in 43 countries. For fiscal year 2025, the Complainant's consolidated revenues reached EUR 24.1 billion, which represent by region: 46 percent North America, 36 percent Europe, and 18 percent for the rest of the world.

The Complainant owns many trademark registrations that consist of or contain the element SODEXO (the "SODEXO Trademark") in a variety of jurisdictions, including in the United States of America, where the Respondent is located, comprising International Trademark Registrations No. 964615 (figurative) registered on January 8, 2008 and No. 1240316 registered on October 23, 2014; European Union Trademark Registrations No. 008346462 registered on February 1, 2010 and No. 006104657 (figurative) registered on June 27, 2008.

The Complainant also owns some trademark registrations that consist of or contain the element SODEXHO (the "SODEXHO Trademark") in various jurisdictions. These comprise International Trademark Registrations No. 689106 (figurative) registered on January 28, 1998 and No. 694302 (figurative) registered on June 22, 1998.

The Complainant also owns and operates several domain names, notably <sodexo.com>, <sodexousa.com>, <sodexho.com> incorporating its SODEXO and SODEXHO trademarks.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on May 21, 2026. As of the date of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website which triggers a warning that the site is malicious identified as phishing.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that each of the elements specified in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in the present case, as follows:

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark, in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its SODEXO and SODEXHO trademarks. The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is an almost identical reproduction of its SODEXO mark, leading the public to believe that the disputed domain name originates from SODEXO or the SODEXO group.

The Complainant submits that the addition of the letter "s" between the letters "o" and "d" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, the Complainant argues that such addition is characteristic of a typo squatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's mark and the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant has consistently enforced its trademark rights against domain names incorporating or otherwise infringing its SODEXO/SODEXHO trademarks through numerous proceedings under the UDRP. In these proceedings, UDRP panels have repeatedly recognized the well-known status and extensive reputation of the Complainant's SODEXO/SODEXHO trademarks. The Complainant prevailed in cases including *SODEXO v. Zhichao Yang* (杨智超), WIPO Case No. [D2020-2286](#), and *Sodexo v. Ashutosh Dwivedi, Food & Beverages*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2686](#), among many others. These decisions further confirm the widespread recognition and distinctiveness of the Complainant's SODEXO/SODEXHO trademarks.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent does not own any trademark rights in the SODEXO Trademark, nor has the Complainant uncovered any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant submits that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the SODEXO Trademarks in any manner, and that there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that would give rise to any right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, the Complainant further submits that Disputed Domain Name is registered in the name of Alicia Farrow, from Arzon Development, who is unknown to the Complainant.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that the SODEXO Trademark has been well known globally for decades. Given the inherently distinctive and well-known character of the Complainant's SODEXO/SODEXHO trademarks, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name constitutes an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and was registered solely to create an association with the Complainant. The Complainant submits that such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b) of the Policy and is consistent with numerous prior UDRP decisions holding that the registration of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark by an unrelated party is itself strong evidence of bad faith.

The Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Name has been used to redirect Internet users to a malicious website, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain and exposing Internet users to potential phishing or malware risks. Such use tarnishes the Complainant's reputation, and constitutes bad faith registration and use under the Policy. Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that the use of a Disputed Domain Name for phishing, malware distribution, or other malicious purposes is compelling evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' 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.

Regarding the letter “s” between the letters “o” and “d”, this is an obvious misspelling (referred to as typo squatting). Hence, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, as per the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

In addition, the Panel determines that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” in the Disputed Domain Name is disregarded, as it is viewed as a technical necessity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 the 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.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists circumstances, in particular but without limitation, which, if found by the Panel to be proved, demonstrate the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, including:

“(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

Regarding paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the Panel finds, based on the Complainant’s submissions and supporting evidence, that the Respondent has not been granted any license, permission, or authorization to use the Complainant’s SODEXO and SODEXHO trademarks. Further, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that the Respondent owns any registered or unregistered trademark rights in any jurisdiction in respect of SODEXO or SODEXHO.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has shown that its attempt to access the Disputed Domain Name – which itself is comprised of an inherently misleading misspelling of the Complainant's trademark – jhas been blocked and triggers a malicious website warning.

Regarding paragraphs 4(c)(ii) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, the Panel finds no evidence that the Respondent, whether as an individual, business, or other organization, has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, nor is there any indication that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. The evidence indicates that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used with knowledge of the Complainant's SODEXO and SODEXHO trademarks and with the intention of capitalizing on the goodwill and reputation associated with that trademark.

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, including:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered 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; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has not submitted a response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's evidence.

The Panel has considered the Complainant's assertions and evidence concerning the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel notes that the Complainant's SODEXO and SODEXHO Trademarks have been registered and extensively used in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the United States of America, where the Respondent resides, have acquired significant recognition in the food services and facilities management sector. These trademark rights and their associated reputation predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's SODEXO trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the “s” which is a typo squatting. Given the distinctiveness of the SODEXO Trademark and its well-known reputation in the food services and facilities management, including in the United States of America, where the Respondent resides, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. On the contrary, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and deliberately chose the Disputed Domain Name in order to mislead users seeking or expecting the Complainant.

The Panel further observes that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a page with a malicious website warning. This constitutes evidence of bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Taking into account all of the above, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, and the third element under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is 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 <sosdexo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac/

Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026