ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
SODEXO v. Francisco Bravo Cambronero, Boston Scientific
Case No. D2026-4279

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Francisco Bravo Cambronero, Boston Scientific, Costa Rica.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexorh.site> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 23, 2026. On September 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 24, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 24, 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 24, 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 October 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Juan Lapenne as the sole panelist in this matter on October 30, 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 is a French company founded in 1966 (previously called Sodexho Alliance). It 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's revenues in 2025 reached 24.1 billion euros. The Complainant is listed as one of "The world's Most Admired Companies" by Fortune magazine.

The Complainant owns a large number of SODEXO trademark registrations throughout the world, such as:

European Union Trade Mark registration No. 008346462 for SODEXO, registered on February 1, 2010, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45.

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.

Costa Rican trademark registration No. 177071 for SODEXO, registered on June 25, 2008, in international class 40.

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was created on September 22, 2026.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names containing the SODEXO trademark, such as <sodexo.com>, <sodexoprestige.co.uk>, <sodexo.fr> and <sodexousa.com>, among others.

Currently the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive or parked page provided by the Registrar Hostinger.

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 trademark SODEXO, as it is composed of the identical SODEXO mark and the letters "RH", which are perceived as the abbreviation of the French expression "ressources humaines".

The Complainant submits that the SODEXO trademark is fanciful, well-known and famous and, therefore, Internet users encountering the disputed domain name will perceive it as either a domain name owned by the Complainant, or that there is some kind of commercial relation with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".site" is irrelevant to determine the confusing similarity between the trademark and the disputed domain name.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has never been licensed, authorized or permitted by the Complainant to use the trademark SODEXO.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name and that he has no rights on SODEXO as a corporate name, trade name, shop sign, mark or domain name that would be prior to the Complainant's rights on SODEXO.

With reference to circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant contends that given the well-known character and reputation of the SODEXO mark, the Respondent obviously knew its existence when he registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that although the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website, under the circumstances of this case, a passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;

(iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights over the trademark SODEXO based on the trademark registrations cited under section 4 above.

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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SODEXO trademark, as it entirely incorporates the well-known SODEXO trademark with the mere addition of the letters "RH" and the gTLD ".site". Indeed, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive or meaningless terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (TLD) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element of the confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has established rights according to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 the instant case, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to incorporate its well-known SODEXO trademark in the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent a licensee or otherwise affiliated to the Complainant.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

On record there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is there any evidence that a website has ever been associated with the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive or parked page provided by the Registrar Hostinger.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name was registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith.

As to registration, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant had registered its SODEXO trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known and fanciful SODEXO trademark with the mere addition of the letters "RH", which may refer to "Recursos Humanos" (the Spanish term of "Human Resources"), Spanish being the official language of Costa Rica, the Respondent's country.

In view of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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, in view of i) the fanciful and well-known character of the Complainant's trademark SODEXO, ii) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, iii) the Respondent's active step to conceal it's contact details by providing the name of a street address which does not seem to be a real one; iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put, the Panel finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name by the Respondent does not prevent a finding of bad faith registration and use.

Therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <sodexorh.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Juan Lapenne/
Juan Lapenne
Sole Panelist
Date: November 10, 2026