

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sodexo v. Sairam Sairam
Case No. D2026-3938

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Sairam Sairam, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexotechnologies.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 2, 2026. On September 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with 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 sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 4, 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 September 7, 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 September 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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 and specialized in food services, (including restaurant and catering services to companies, hospitals, schools and other organizations) and facilities management (including reception, hospitality, cleaning and infrastructure management services). With over 426,000 employees it serves 80 million consumers in around 43 countries worldwide on a daily basis. For the fiscal year 2025, the consolidated revenues of the Complainant reached approximately EUR 24.1 billion spread over the regions of North America at 46 %, Europe at 36 %, and the rest of the world at 18 % (as per Annex 4 to the Complaint). From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the brand SODEXHO and simplified to SODEXO since 2008. The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for the brand SODEXO, including the following (as per Annexes 5, 7, 12 and 14):

- International trademark registration no. 964615 SODEXO (figurative), registered on January 8, 2008, for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, protected in several jurisdictions, including Armenia, Azerbaijan, Australia, among others;
- European Union trademark registration no. 008346462 SODEXO (word), registered on February 1, 2010 for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45; and
- Indian trademark registration no. 1635770 SODEXO (figurative), registered on December 28, 2007 for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42.

The Complainant owns and uses numerous domain names corresponding to the SODEXO trademark, such as <sodexo.com>, <sodexoprestige.co.uk>, <sodexo.fr> or <sodexousa.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 31, 2026 (as per Annex 1 to the Complaint). At the time of the Complaint, it resolved to a parked page and displayed “SODEXOTECHNOLOGIES.COM Launching Soon” and “Contact Us” (as per Annex 13 to the Complaint).

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 a trademark, in which it owns rights. For this, the Complainant points to its registered rights in the trademark SODEXO which is, according to the Complainant, a fanciful term and has no meaning in relation to the Complainant's business. The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, with the addition of “technologies” being an obvious generic term likely to be perceived by the public as pointing to the Complainant's IT department. Thus, the SODEXO mark remains dominant within the disputed domain name. The Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

On the second element, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent, according to the Complainant, has no rights in SODEXO as a corporate name, domain name or on any other basis that could be prior to the Complainant's

trademark rights. Also, the Respondent, to the Complainant's knowledge, was not commonly known by the disputed domain name, does not have any affiliation or other connection with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to register or use the disputed domain name.

On the third element, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. On registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that its trademark SODEXO is well-known and reputed around the world, and besides that purely fanciful, so that nobody could legitimately choose this word as part of a domain name unless seeking to create an association with the Complainant. Thus, according to the Complainant, it is obvious that the Respondent not only knew about the Complainant's trademark, but also wanted to profit from its reputation. As to use in bad faith, the Complainant argues that the present non-use of the disputed domain name for a website with active content does not prevent a finding of bad faith given the totality of the circumstances of the case, namely the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the trademark involved, the failure of the Respondent to provide a reason for registration, the concealing of its contact details, and the absence of any present or probable good faith use.

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, "technologies", 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. The Panel further notes the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and thus prevents a finding of rights and/or legitimate interests on behalf of 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 has registered the disputed domain name fully incorporating the Complainant's SODEXO trademark, with the addition of the generic term "technologies", and that the disputed domain name is currently parked announcing that a website would be launched soon.

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.

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. [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 Respondent's failure to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put. Accordingly, 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 <sodexotechnologies.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026