ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. jiang tao tao
Case No. D2026-2638

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is jiang tao tao, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bebysodexo.com> is registered with Longming Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 17, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 24, 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 25, 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 June 30, 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 July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Nels T. Lippert as the sole panelist in this matter on August 3, 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.

The Panel notes the Complainant’s request that these proceedings be conducted in the English language although the registration agreement for the disputed domain name apparently is in the Chinese language. As no objection has been made, the Panel agrees that these proceedings be conducted in English.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a French company founded in 1966, specializing in food services and facilities management. The Complainant is one of the largest companies in the world in its sector, with 426,000 employees serving 80 million consumers daily in 43 countries. For fiscal year 2025, the Complainant’s consolidated revenues reached EUR 24.1 billion.

The Complainant operates under the trade name and mark SODEXO. From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the mark and name SODEXHO. In 2008, the Complainant simplified the spelling to SODEXO and changed its logo accordingly.

The Complainant’s services include food services (restaurant and catering services to companies, hospitals, schools, universities and other organizations) and facility management services (combining reception, hospitality, cleaning and infrastructure maintenance services).

Fortune Magazine has listed the Complainant as one of “The World’s Most Admired Companies.”

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

- SODEXO (stylized) – International Trademark Registration No. 964615 registered on January 8, 2008, designated, among others, to China and the United States of America;

- SODEXO – Europe Union Trademark Registration No. 008346462 registered on February 1, 2010; and

- SODEXO (stylized) – European Union Registration No. 006104657 registered on June 27, 2008.

Numerous previous panels have acknowledged the Complainant’s rights in the SODEXO mark and found that the mark is “well known”. The Panel has no reason to doubt this finding and considers the mark SODEXO to be well known.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names including <sodexo.com>, <sodexo.fr>, <sodexoca.com>, <sodexousa.com> and <sodexho.com>. Additionally, the Complainant’s subsidiary in Belgium operates the mobile application “B BY SODEXO.”

The disputed domain name was registered on June 13, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to website that offered online gambling. Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive site.

The Respondent appears to be an individual residing in China.

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 Complainant's mark because it includes the mark in its entirety along with the descriptive terms "be" and "by". The Complainant asserts that the addition of the two descriptive terms in the disputed domain name does not avoid confusing similarity. The Complainant also notes that the risk of confusion with the Complainant's mark is heightened due to the mobile application "B BY SODEXO" which is used by its subsidiary in Belgium.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no affiliation, association, sponsorship or connection with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant or any subsidiary or affiliated company to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent was not commonly known by the disputed domain name prior to the Complainant's adoption and use of its mark.

In addition, the Complainant contends that given the well-known reputation of its mark, the Respondent obviously knew of its existence when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to attract and redirect Internet users to its website offering online gambling for the purpose of commercial gain. While offering no evidence of fraudulent activity, the Complainant asserts that there is the threat of abusive use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent such as for phishing.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

As noted above, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's contentions. Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a default by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint. The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstance in this case.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest a respondent of a domain name, a complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

(iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall 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".

In this case, the Panel finds that as a result of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant. By failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent failed to provide any information or reasoning that might rebut the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted in bad faith.

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, "be" and "by" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

Furthermore, it is well established that the applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such 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 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 website at the disputed domain name became inactive following the notification of the Complaint. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has provided ample evidence that the Respondent registered and used, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4. Moreover, Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity, as is the case here, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

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 <bebysodexo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nels T. Lippert/
Nels T. Lippert
Sole Panelist
Date: August 16, 2026