

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. No Name
Case No. D2025-1770

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Carrefour SA, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is No Name, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefour-avisos.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 2, 2025. On May 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 2, 2025, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. On May 28, 2025, a domain name that was initially included in the Complaint was withdrawn from the proceeding. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 28, 2025, 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 May 28, 2025.

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 June 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on July 2, 2025. 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 based company and a worldwide leader in retail and operates stores around the world; it also offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations containing the mark CARREFOUR around the world, inter alia:

- European Union trademark registration (word), Reg. No 008779498, registered July 13, 2010;
 - French trademark registration (word), Reg. No. 1565338, registered May 25, 1990;
 - United States of America trademark registration (word), Reg. No. 6763415, registered June 21, 2022;
- and
- International trademark registration (word), Reg. No 563304, registered November 6, 1990, designated for several countries around the world (Annexes 3 – 7 to the Complaint).

It further owns several domain name registrations containing the mark CARREFOUR, e.g. <carrefour.com>, registered October 25, 1995, and <carrefour.fr>, registered June 23, 2005 (Annex 11 and 20 to the Complaint).

The Complainant also has online presences on Facebook, TikTok, and Instagram (Annexes 8 – 10 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered April 7, 2025 (Annex 1 to the Complaint). At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website (Annex 15 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 the distinctive CARREFOUR mark in which the Complainant has rights. The only difference to the CARREFOUR mark is the descriptive suffix "avisos" together with a hyphen between the Complainant's mark CARREFOUR and "avisos". The descriptive term cannot eliminate the confusing similarity towards the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark.

Furthermore, the Complainant notes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not linked to the Complainant in any way whatsoever and has never been authorized by the Complainant to register domain names that are similar to its trademark. The Respondent is moreover not commonly known by or associated with the disputed domain name and do not use it for any bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. The disputed domain name was registered decades after the Complainant has established rights in the mark CARREFOUR and this mark is distinctive and well-known; hence, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights in the mark CARREFOUR when registering the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website, which is also in the concept of bad faith use under the Policy and there is no plausible possible reason for a bona fide use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the mark CARREFOUR for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark CARREFOUR in which the Complainant has rights since it incorporates the entirety of the mark and only adds the term "avisos" (which means notice, warning) as suffix together with a hyphen between the CARREFOUR mark and "avisos".

It has long been established under UDRP decisions that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the mere addition of other terms, especially descriptive terms like in the present case, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. This is the case at present. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-level Domains ("gTLDs") (in this case ".com") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to

come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the 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, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the CARREFOUR trademark in any manner.

The Respondent is not known under the disputed domain name and the disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services; rather the disputed domain name is passively held by the Respondent which does not establish legitimate rights in the disputed domain name under the circumstances of this case.

Finally, the Respondent did not provide any evidence showing its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy, both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith; and
- the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

(i) The Complainant has established rights in the distinctive mark CARREFOUR decades before the registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant is using the mark CARREFOUR as its primary domain name, <carrefour.com>, to address its business website; the Complainant has also a strong Internet presence on Facebook, TikTok, and Instagram.

Because of the distinctiveness and the reputation of the CARREFOUR mark, it is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a distinctive trademark by an unaffiliated entity (as it is in the present case) can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Moreover, the term "avisos" as suffix to the CARREFOUR mark in the disputed domain name rather strengthens the impression that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name.

Finally, a simple online search for "carrefour" would have shown the Complainant and its marks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.3.

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

(ii) The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a website with no content. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page, a registrar's parking page or website with no active content like in the present case) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and the nature of the disputed domain name support the finding that 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.

Furthermore, this Panel's finding is reinforced by the following:

- the Complainant's trademark CARREFOUR is distinctive;
- the disputed domain name is inherently misleading, and is thus suited to divert or mislead potential Internet users from the website they are trying to visit (the Complainant's site) and giving the false impression that the Respondent may be in some way related with the Complainant, which is not the case; and
- there is no conceivable, plausible bona fide use with regard to the disputed domain name considering it clearly targets the Complainant's trademark.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to present any evidence of any good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain name further supports the finding of bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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 <carrefour-avisos.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: July 15, 2025