

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc.
Case No. D2026-3365

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc., Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexo-engage.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 29, 2026. On July 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 30, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0178962596) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 14, 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 August 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Erica Aoki as the sole panelist in this matter on September 24, 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, SODEXO, is a French company founded in 1966 and is one of the largest companies in the world specialized in food services and facilities management, with more than 426,000 employees serving approximately 80 million consumers daily in 43 countries.

For fiscal year 2025, the Complainant reported consolidated revenues of EUR 24.1 billion.

From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the SODEXHO trademark and trade name. In 2008, the Complainant simplified the spelling of its mark and name to SODEXO. The Complainant provides a wide range of services under the SODEXO trademark, including food services and facilities management services.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for SODEXO and SODEXHO worldwide, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 964615 for SODEXO, registered on January 8, 2008, in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45;

- International Trademark Registration No. 1240316 for SODEXO, registered on October 23, 2014, in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45; and

- International Trademark Registration No. 689106 for SODEXHO, registered on January 28, 1998, in International Classes 16, 36, 37, 39, 41, and 42.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names corresponding to or incorporating the SODEXO and SODEXHO marks, including <sodexo.com>.

The disputed domain name <sodexo-engage.com> was registered on July 25, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying sponsored links to third-party websites, including links related to restaurants.

The evidence submitted with the Complaint also shows that the disputed domain name was offered for sale for USD 2,888.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SODEXO trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces the SODEXO trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "engage", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the SODEXO/SODEXHO trademarks have a strong reputation and are widely known throughout the world, and notes that previous UDRP panels have recognized the well-known character of the SODEXO/SODEXHO trademarks.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the SODEXO trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the reputation and extensive use of the SODEXO trademark, the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to a parking page displaying sponsored links for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant further relies on the fact that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale for USD 2,888 as additional evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant requests that 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

The Complainant is required to establish each of the three elements under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, namely:

- (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.

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 the SODEXO trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's SODEXO trademark in its entirety, followed by a hyphen and the term "engage". The SODEXO trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the addition of the term "engage" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is therefore 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its SODEXO trademark or to register a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trademark. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying sponsored links to third-party websites, including links related to restaurants. Such use does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services where the links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s SODEXO trademark in its entirety together with the term “engage”, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and therefore cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

The Complainant’s rights in the SODEXO trademark significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. In view of the reputation and extensive use of the SODEXO trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the SODEXO trademark in its entirety, and the use of the disputed domain name for a parking page displaying links related to the Complainant’s field of activity, the Panel finds that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant and its SODEXO trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a parking page displaying sponsored links to third-party websites constitutes an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SODEXO trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale for USD 2,888. In the overall circumstances of this case, including the incorporation of the Complainant's SODEXO trademark in its entirety and the use of the disputed domain name for a parking page displaying sponsored links, the Panel considers the offer for sale to constitute additional evidence supporting a finding of bad faith.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response or provided any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been 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 <sodexo-engage.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Erica Aoki/

Erica Aoki

Sole Panelist

Date: October 5, 2026