ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
SODEXO v. CRMC admin Andrews, CRMC
Case No. DPW2026-0004

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is CRMC admin Andrews, CRMC, United States of America ("U.S." or "United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sodexo.pw> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 30, 2026. On October 1, 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 ("Unnamed Respondent") and the contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 2, 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 October 2, 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 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Jonathan Agmon as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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 and formerly known as SODEXHO ALLIANCE. It specializes in food services and facilities management, with more than 426,000 employees serving 80 million consumers in 43 countries. For fiscal year 2025, consolidated revenues reached EUR 24.1 billion.

From 1966 to 2008, the Complainant promoted its business under the SODEXHO mark and trade name. In 2008, the Complainant simplified the spelling of its mark and name by removing the letter 'H' and adopting SODEXO.

The Complainant provides a wide range of services under its trade name and mark SODEXO through an offer of on-site services including food catering, food delivery, hospitality and cleaning, and infrastructure maintenance.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names corresponding to and/or containing "Sodexo" or "Sodexho". The Complainant promotes its activities among others under the following domain names: <sodexo.com>, <uk.sodexo.com>, <sodexoprestige.co.uk>, <sodexo.fr>, <sodexoca.com>, <sodexousa.com>, <cn.sodexo.com>, <sodexho.fr>, and <sodexho.com>.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following registered marks:

- International trademark no. 964615 for SODEXO (stylized), registered on January 8, 2008;
- International trademark no. 1240316 for SODEXO, registered on October 23, 2014;
- European Union trademark no. 008346462 for SODEXO, registered on February 1, 2010; and
- United States trademark no. 3722463 for SODEXO (stylized), registered on December 8, 2009.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 23, 2026. At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name did not resolve any 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:

1. The domain name is identical to the SODEXO mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name is identical to the SODEXO mark, as it is composed in its entirety. The country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") in a domain name (in this case, ".pw") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and, as such, is disregarded under the confusing similarity test. In other words, ccTLD ".pw" is disregarded to assess the identity or similarity between the disputed domain name and the prior trademark as it is a technical requirement of registration. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. Given the reproduction of the SODEXO mark, the public will likely believe that the disputed domain name comes from the Complainant or is linked to the Complainant. Confusion is more likely since the Complainant uses widely the domain name <sodexo.com> to connect to its official website.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent holds no prior rights in SODEXO as a corporate name, trade name, shop sign, mark or domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name before the Complainant adopted and used the SODEXO mark. The Respondent also has no affiliation, association, sponsorship or connection with the Complainant, and has not been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates to register or use the domain name.

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The SODEXO mark is purely fanciful, and no one could legitimately choose it or any variation of it except to create an association with the Complainant's activities under the SODEXO mark. Given the reputation of the SODEXO mark, the Respondent obviously knew of its existence when registering the disputed domain name and therefore knew that he had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and could not lawfully use it. Previous UDRP decisions recognize that actual knowledge of a complainant's trademarks and activities at the time of registration may support an inference of bad faith. The Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights, very likely to create confusion with the Complainant's SODEXO mark and divert or mislead third parties for his own illegitimate profit. Although the recently created disputed domain name does not currently appear to resolve to an active website, passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. Panels consider the totality of the circumstances, and relevant factors under the passive holding doctrine include the distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, the respondent's failure to respond or to provide evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the respondent's concealment of its identity or use of false or inaccurate contact details. Bad faith use may also arise from the threat of abusive use of the domain name, for instance for phishing. Having recently faced several such attacks, the Complainant strongly fears that the disputed domain name will be used fraudulently for phishing. The Respondent's unauthorized registration and apparently passive holding of the disputed domain name, likely with a view to fraudulent use, are for commercial gain and constitute bad faith registration and 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 SODEXO is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark SODEXO for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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 record also shows that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. There is therefore no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of it, within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Nor is there anything in the record to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by 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 Complainant's SODEXO mark was registered many years before the registration of the disputed domain name on September 23, 2026. The Panel notes that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant's SODEXO mark due to its distinctiveness and significant reputation when the Respondent registered 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. On 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 of the Complainant's mark as a coined term with no dictionary meaning, and the considerable reputation of the Complainant's mark, gained through long, international use. The composition of the disputed domain name being identical to the Complainant's mark by chance is therefore highly implausible. The Panel also takes into account the Respondent's failure to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name. 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. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <sodexo.pw> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonathan Agmon/
Jonathan Agmon
Sole Panelist
Date: November 9, 2026