

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Domain Privacy

Case No. D2026-3655

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mysodexosavings.com> is registered with Drop Catch Mining LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 14, 2026. On August 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 20, 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 (PERFECT PRIVACY, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 21, 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 21, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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 was founded in 1966 as the French company Sodexo (prior called Sodexho Alliance) and is one of the largest companies in the world specialized in food services and facilities management, with more than 426 000 employees serving daily 80 million consumers in 43 countries. The Complainant is one of the largest employers worldwide.

The Complainant owns among others the following registered marks: SODEXO, European Union Trademark Registration No. 008346462, filed on June 8, 2009, registered on February 1, 2026, and renewed in 2019 in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45; SODEXO, International Trademark Registration No. 1240316 filed on October 23, 2014 and renewed in 2024 in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, and protected in Iran (Islamic Republic of), and Mozambique.

The Complainant operates its website at “www.sodexo.com”. The Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <mysodexosavingsplan.com> in connection with its savings plan services.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 8, 2026. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to various websites through a website with pay-per-click (PPC) links.

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; the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith to attract Internet users for commercial gain. 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.

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, “my” and “savings” 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.

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 Complainant owns and uses the domain name <mysodexosavingsplan.com> in connection with its savings plan services. The composition of the disputed domain name, which combines the Complainant’s SODEXO trademark with the terms “my” and “savings”, closely mirrors the Complainant’s existing domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and targeted its trademark and business when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel further finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitute 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 <mysodexosavings.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2026