

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. Estefany Rengifo Rengifo, terceros sodexo
Case No. D2026-3537

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Estefany Rengifo Rengifo, terceros sodexo, Peru, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tercerossodexo.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complainant filed the Complaint with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 10, 2026. On August 11, 2026, the Center emailed the Registrar requesting registrar verification regarding the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center emailed the Complainant on August 12, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar and inviting the Complainant to amend the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 12, 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”).

On August 19, 2026, the Center received a copy of correspondence from the Respondent to the Complainant, in which the Respondent asked what steps might be taken to modify or otherwise resolve the matter concerning the disputed domain name. In response, on August 20, 2026, the Complainant indicated a willingness to explore settlement. However, neither party submitted a formal request to suspend the proceeding, nor did either party submit a duly signed settlement agreement to the Center.

As a result, under the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 20, 2026. Under the Rules, paragraph 5, the due

date for Response was September 9, 2026. On August 25, 2026, the Respondent emailed the Center and stated that she acquired the disputed domain name because it was available for registration at the time of purchase. On the same day, the Center again invited the parties to consider settlement, noting that the proceedings could be suspended for this purpose. No such request was received. On September 1, 2026, the Respondent sent a further communication to the Center, requesting that the disputed domain name be deleted and that a new domain name be issued to her in its place.

The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent of the commencement of the panel appointment process on September 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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.

On September 19, 2026, the Respondent sent a new email communication.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is SODEXO, a French company founded in 1966 (formerly called SODEXHO ALLIANCE).

The Complainant is an international company providing food services and facilities management services and operates in numerous countries, including Peru.

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

The Complainant owns numerous registrations for the SODEXO trademark, including Peruvian trademark registration No. P00141233 for SODEXO and design, registered on August 11, 2008, in International Class 9. The evidence submitted shows that this registration remains in force until August 11, 2028. The Complainant also owns additional Peruvian registrations for the SODEXO mark in Classes 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45.

According to the Amended Complaint, the Complainant has an established business presence in numerous countries, including Peru, where the Respondent is located. The Complainant operates a Peruvian website at "pe.sodexo.com".

The disputed domain name is <tercerossodexo.com>, which was registered on August 7, 2026.

Following the Registrar's verification, the Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant as Estefany Rengifo Rengifo, with the organization identified as "terceros sodexo", located in Peru.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page provided by the Registrar, displaying various links to third-party content, including links labeled "Voyage", "Spectacle", and "Shopping", as well as an invitation to acquire the disputed domain name.

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 incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, together with the Spanish term "terceros" (meaning "third parties" in English) and an additional letter "s". The Complainant therefore contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SODEXO trademark, which remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has not made any legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name. 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 to use it. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith as the disputed domain name is redirected to <tercerossodexo.com/lander> which shows that the disputed domain name is available for sale on GoDaddy. The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response. In its informal communications, the Respondent stated that the disputed domain name had been available for registration and requested that it be deleted and replaced with another domain name. The Respondent did not substantively address the Policy's three elements.

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 Panel finds that the Complainant's SODEXO mark is 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.

Although the addition of the Spanish term "terceros" and an additional letter "s" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, these additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Regarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name, it is well established that a gTLD does not affect the assessment for the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity. [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 non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests with the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests may require the complainant to establish a prima facie case. Once such a prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the

respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, although the ultimate burden of proof remains with the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant states that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its SODEXO or SODEXHO trademarks or to register the disputed domain name. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has acquired any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name.

The Registrar disclosed the registrant as “Estefany Rengifo Rengifo” and identified the registrant organization as “terceros sodexo”. However, the mere inclusion of that designation in the registration data does not, without supporting evidence, establish that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has provided no independent evidence of any business, organization, or other bona fide activity conducted under the name “terceros sodexo”. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

The record further shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a registrar-provided parking page displaying links to third-party content and an invitation to acquire the disputed domain name. Although the mere presence of such links is not independently determinative, it does not, without more, establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the circumstances of this case, the parking page does not by itself rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case, particularly given that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s distinctive SODEXO mark in its entirety and, through the addition of the Spanish term “terceros”, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.1 and 2.9.

The Respondent’s informal communications, stating that the disputed domain name had been available for registration and requesting that it be deleted and replaced with another domain name, do not establish any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and do not rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances 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 trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name on August 7, 2026. The SODEXO mark is distinctive and has been extensively used and registered internationally, including in Peru, where the Respondent is located.

The Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SODEXO trademark when registering the disputed domain name. In particular, the disputed domain name incorporates the SODEXO mark in its entirety, preceded by the Spanish word “terceros” and an additional letter “s”. Moreover, the Registrar-disclosed registration data identified the registrant organization as “terceros sodexo”.

These circumstances indicate that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its trademark in mind.

The Respondent’s statement that the disputed domain name was available for registration does not provide a credible explanation for selecting the Complainant’s distinctive trademark. The mere availability of a domain name for registration does not authorize its registration or use in a manner that targets the trademark rights of another party.

The disputed domain name resolves to a registrar-provided parking page displaying links to third-party content and an invitation to acquire the disputed domain name. Although the record does not establish that the Respondent personally selected the displayed links or directly profited from them, the Respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for content appearing on the website associated with the disputed domain name. The fact that such content may have been generated by the Registrar, or that the Respondent may not have directly profited from it, does not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5.

In particular, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's distinctive SODEXO mark in its entirety and combines it with the Spanish term "terceros", creating an appearance of affiliation with, or authorization by, the Complainant. The Registrar-disclosed registration data further identifies the Respondent's organization as "terceros sodexo", confirming that the selection of the disputed domain name was not coincidental. The Respondent has offered no credible explanation for that selection. Its assertion that the disputed domain name was available for registration does not justify registering a domain name that includes another party's trademark, even with additional words.

The Panel has also considered the Respondent's informal request that the disputed domain name be deleted and that another domain name be issued to it. That communication does not establish a good-faith purpose for the registration or use of the disputed domain name and does not alter the Panel's assessment of the circumstances existing at the time of registration.

Having considered the composition of the disputed domain name, the Complainant's prior and distinctive trademark rights, the Respondent's registration details, the absence of any credible good-faith explanation, and the manner in which the disputed domain name has been used, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <tercerossodexo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: September 28, 2026