

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SODEXO v. hong shun li, lihong shun
Case No. D2026-3559

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is hong shun li, lihong shun, Philippines.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexoobrs.com> is registered with GMO Internet Group, Inc. d/b/a Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 11, 2026. On August 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 12, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 19, 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 19, 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 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Indrek Eelmets as the sole panelist in this matter on September 21, 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 world's largest companies specializing in food services and facilities management. According to the Complaint, the Complainant has more than 426,000 employees and serves approximately 80 million consumers daily in 43 countries. In the fiscal year 2025, the Complainant had consolidated revenues of EUR 24.1 billion.

The Complainant owns a substantial portfolio of SODEXO trademarks, including:

Jurisdictions	Trademarks	Registration Numbers	Registration Date
Philippines		PH4200700013811	May 26, 2008
European Union	SODEXO	008346462	February 1, 2010
International, designating, inter alia, Japan, United States of America, and China		964615	January 8, 2008

The Complainant provides a wide range of services under this trademark, including food services and facility management services.

The Complainant claims it is also the registered proprietor of many domain names containing SODEXO, including: <sodexo.com>, <sodexoprestige.co.uk>, <sodexo.fr>, <sodexoca.com>, and <sodexousa.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 5, 2026. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to an active website in Chinese language offering online gambling, which appeared to provide access to Internet users by means of a username and password. At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since the disputed domain name contains the mark in its entirety, with the addition of an additional letter "o" and the element "brs". According to the Complainant, "BRS" abbreviates "Benefits and Rewards Services" and claims that it is well known for its prior activity relating to employee benefit and reward services.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since the Respondent is unknown to the Complainant, has no rights in SODEXO as a

corporate name, trade name, trademark, or domain name, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has no affiliation, association, sponsorship, or other connection with the Complainant. The Complainant further states that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the well-known character and reputation of the SODEXO trademark, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to attract and redirect Internet users to an online gambling website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant also raises concerns that the website's apparent login functionality could be used to obtain Internet users' personal data and that the disputed domain name could potentially be used for fraudulent purposes, including phishing.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, an additional letter "o" and the term "brs", 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.

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. In particular, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized by the Complainant or is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to an online gambling website does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation, which also prevents a finding of rights or legitimate interests for the Respondent. [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 Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the trademark before registration of the disputed domain name given the trademark had been registered and had become well-known internationally prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel further finds that the composition of the disputed domain name itself, reproducing the Complainant's trademark and adding the letter "o" and the term "brs" after the trademark in the disputed domain name (with the letters "brs", as alleged by the Complainant, may be read as standing for "benefits and rewards services") is prone to create confusion among Internet users as to its affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant. The composition of the disputed domain name therefore further supports a finding that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its trademark. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to a website associated with online gambling, which appeared to require a username and password for further access. The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name in this manner supports a finding that the Respondent sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website at the date of this Decision does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

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 <sodexoobrs.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Indrek Eelmets/

Indrek Eelmets

Sole Panelist

Date: October 5, 2026