

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Meadow Heckman

Case No. D2026-2706

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Meadow Heckman, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexointernal.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 22, 2026. On June 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 23, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 24, 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 29, 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 August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Anna Carabelli as the sole panelist in this matter on August 6, 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 the information and supporting documents provided with the Complaint, the Complainant is a French company (formerly known as Sodexho Alliance) specialized in food services and facilities management. Founded in 1966, it currently has 426,000 employees serving 80 million consumers in 43 countries. The Complainant's consolidated revenues in 2025 reached EUR 24.1 billion.

The Complainant is listed as one of "The world's Most Admired Companies" by Fortune Magazine.

From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the mark and trade name SODEXHO, which in 2008 was simplified to SODEXO. The Complainant's logo was also changed accordingly.

The Complainant provides a wide range of services under its trade name and mark SODEXO (formerly SODEXHO) through an offer of on-site services. The Complainant has various locations worldwide including in the United States where the Respondent is purportedly located.

The Complainant owns registered trademark rights for the SODEXO word mark and for various combined word and logo marks that incorporate the mark SODEXO in many jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration (word mark) filed on June 8, 2009, registered under No. 008346462 on February 1, 2010, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45;
- European Union trademark registration (figurative) filed on July 16, 2007, registered under No. 006104657 on June 27, 2008, renewed in 2017, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45; and
- International trademark registration (word mark) filed on October 23, 2014, registered under No. 1240316 on October 23, 2014, renewed in 2024, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.

The Complainant also owns various domain names corresponding to or including and/or containing SODEXO, and promotes its activities, among others, under the domain names <sodexo.com>, <uk.sodexo.com>, and <sodexoprestige.co.uk>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 17, 2026, and does not resolve to an active website.

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 Complainant's SODEXO trademark is distinctive and globally recognized, as established in numerous previous UDRP decisions;

- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, since it consists of the Complainant's SODEXO mark with the addition of the term "internal". Because of this composition, the disputed domain name is perceived by the public as referring to a website or email address used by SODEXO employees for internal communications or processes;
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since: (i) the Respondent has no rights in "sodexo" as a corporate name, trade name, trademark or domain name; (ii) the Respondent was not commonly known by the disputed domain name prior to the adoption and use by the Complainant of the corporate name, business name and trademark SODEXO; (iii) 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; and
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark SODEXO is purely fanciful and well-known worldwide, as previous UDRP decisions have already recognized. The unauthorized registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent and its passive holding are likely in the aim of fraudulent use and constitute bad faith registration and use.

Based on the above, the Complainant requests the disputed domain name be transferred 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 the Panel to decide the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four illustrative circumstances, which for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances any one of which, if found by the Panel, shall be evidence of the Respondent's rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy above.

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 and 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](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the Top-Level Domain, such as “.com”, is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms, here “internal”, 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. There is no indication before the Panel of any activity in relation to the disputed domain name that would give rise to rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Panel notes the nature of the disputed domain name as discussed in paragraph A. above, which carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 disputed domain name incorporates the SODEXO mark in its entirety. Prior UDRP decisions have consistently recognized that the Complainant's trademark SODEXO is purely fanciful and well-known worldwide (see *Sodexho Alliance v. LaPorte Holdings, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0287](#); *Sodexo v. Shahzan – PrivacyProtect.org*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-1308](#); *Sodexo v. Sodexho Catering*, CID-300335SOD, CID-512981SOD, Ilker Sirin, WIPO Case No. [D2013-1950](#); *Sodexo v. Elena Shaffer*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0810](#); *Sodexo v. Li Li*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1018](#); *Sodexo v. DomainJet, Inc.*, Jack Sun, WIPO Case No. [D2013-2187](#); *Sodexo v. Jack Brabham*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1781](#); *Sodexo v. Sodexo Now*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0071](#); *Sodexo v. Daniela Ortiz*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0628](#); and *Sodexo v. Italo Trentino*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3714](#)).

Given the distinctiveness and well-established reputation of the Complainant's trademark, in the Panel's view it is not conceivable that the Respondent did not have the Complainant's trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. Such circumstances suggest that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2) with a deliberate intent to create an impression of an association with the Complainant.

As regards bad faith use, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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. Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark; (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; and (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity. Taking the above factors into consideration, panels assess the overall plausibility of any (claimed) good faith use to which the domain name may be put in light of the composition of the domain name in relation to the relevant mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, as well as the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put in view of the misleading nature of the disputed domain name, 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 <sodexointernal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anna Carabelli/

Anna Carabelli

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2026