

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Carrefour SA v. Minha loja Admin, Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados, Minha loja Admin, TennisPro, and Atacalar Oficial, Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados  
Case No. D2025-3071

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondents are Minha loja Admin, Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados, Argentina, Minha loja Admin, TennisPro, Brazil, and Atacalar Oficial, Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados, Brazil.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <carrefour-ar.com>, <carrefour-arg.com>, <carrefour-arg.store>, <carrefour-ar.store>, and <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 1, 2025. On August 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Contact Privacy Inc., Contact Privacy Inc. / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175630147 / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175719339 / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175630091 / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175697830 / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175641366) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 6, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 8, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on September 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 005178371, registered August 30, 2007; and
- International Trademark Registrations (word), Reg. No 351147, registered October 2, 1968, and Reg. No. 353849, registered February 28, 1969, designating several jurisdictions around the world (Annexes 4.1 – 4.4 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 (Annexes 5.1 and 5.2 to the Complaint).

The Complainant also has online presence on social media platforms, especially on Facebook (Annex 7.1 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain names were registered on July 22, 2025 for <carrefour-ar.com>, July 15, 2025 for <carrefour-ar.store>, July 25, 2025 for <carrefour-arg.com>, July 15, 2025 for <carrefour-arg.store>, and July 16, 2025 for <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> (Annexes 2.1.1 – 2.1.5 to the Complaint).

Prior to filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names <carrefour-ar.com>, <carrefour-arg.com> and <carrefour-arg.store> resolved to nearly identical websites showing the Complainant’s trademark with its logo  (Annexes 9.1.1, 9.1.3 and 9.1.4 to the Complaint) and the disputed domain names <carrefour-ar.com> and <carrefour-arg.store> were inactive at the time of filing of the Complaint; the disputed domain name <carrefour-ar.store> did not resolve to an active website (Annex 9.1.2 to the Complaint); and the disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> redirected to the domain name <pay-pagoseguro-checkout-carritofinal-seguro.shop> which resolved to a generic e-commerce website named “Modern Hogar” (Annex 9.1.5 to the Complaint).

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant asks for consolidating the disputes against different disputed domain names' registrants in a single proceeding since there is a set of indicators that suggest that the disputed domain names were registered by the same entity.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the distinctive CARREFOUR mark in which the Complainant has rights. The only difference to the CARREFOUR mark are the terms or letters "ar" and "arg", "argentina", "pay", "seguro", and "checkout" together with a hyphen between the Complainant's mark CARREFOUR and the terms. With regard to the disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> the well-known trademark CARREFOUR is reproduced in its entirety and immediately recognizable since the addition of the terms "argentina", "pay", "seguro", and "checkout" cannot prevent the finding of confusing similarity towards the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark.

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

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

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names either resolved to an inactive website or to a website with content and with the Complainant's mark CARREFOUR and logo; the disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> was used to redirect to the domain name <pay-pagoseguro-checkout-carrifinal-seguro.shop>, hosting a generic e-commerce website named "Modern Hogar", which can only be explained as an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to this website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondents' website.

### **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- the disputed domain names were registered within 10 days (between July 15, 2025 and July 25, 2025);
- the first and last name of the registrant regarding the disputed domain names <carrefour-ar.store>, <carrefour-ar.com>, <carrefour-arg.store> and <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> are the same; only with regard to the disputed domain name <carrefour-arg.com> the first and last name of the registrant is different;
- the registrant organization for the disputed domain names <carrefour-ar.store>, <carrefour-ar.com>, <carrefour-arg.store> and <carrefour-arg.com> is the same; only with regard to the disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> the registrant organization name is different;
- the Registrar for the disputed domain names is the same;
- the disputed domain names (except the disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop>) have a very similar naming pattern;
- all the telephone numbers associated with the underlying registrants use the international code (for Brazil), even though some are reportedly based in Argentina;
- the email addresses used in connection with the disputed domain names <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> and <carrefour-arg.com>, are not valid;
- prior to filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names <carrefour-ar.com>, <carrefour-arg.com> and <carrefour-arg.store> referred to a website showing the Complainant's trademark with its logo; and
- finally, the Respondents did not react in any way to the proceedings – the Respondents neither objected to the consolidation request nor filed any Response.

Therefore, as regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

## **7. Discussion and Findings**

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

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 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 names are confusingly similar to the CARREFOUR mark in which the Complainant has rights since they incorporate the entirety of the mark CARREFOUR and only add terms,

namely “ar” or “arg” together with a hyphen, and with regard to the disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop>, the terms “argentina”, “pay”, “seguro”, and “checkout”.

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

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-level Domains (“gTLDs”) (in this case “.com”, “.store” and “.shop”) 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 names, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the CARREFOUR mark in any manner.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain names, comprising the Complainant’s mark CARREFOUR together with the country code for Argentina (“-ar”) and, with regard to the disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop>, together with merely geographical term and the terms associated with the Complainant’s business, coupled with the (prior) use of the disputed domain names, is likely to mislead Internet users, cannot be considered fair use – the opposite is the case: such conduct does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests. In this regard, the Panel also notes that the registrant organization identified in the registration details of four of the disputed domain name is “Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados”, however, there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is actually commonly known by the disputed domain names or “Carrefour” or “Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados”. Rather, it appears most likely that such details were specifically chosen to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant.

The Respondent did not file a response and hence has not rebutted the Complainant’s contentions.

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 (e.g. *Robert Ellenbogen v. Mike Pearson*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0001](#)) both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent in bad faith, and
- the disputed domain names are being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

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

Because of the reputation of the CARREFOUR mark, it is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names 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 famous 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 country code for Argentina as suffix to the CARREFOUR mark in the disputed domain names rather strengthens the impression that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain names, as the Complainant operates in Argentina; the same is true with regard to the disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> and the addition of the merely geographical/related terms "argentina", "pay", "seguro", and "checkout" to the distinctive and well-known mark CARREFOUR.

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 names were registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

(ii) The Complainant has put forward evidence that the disputed domain names <carrefour-ar.com>, <carrefour-arg.com> and <carrefour-arg.store> were used by the Respondent prior to filing of the Complaint to resolve to websites showing the Complainant's mark and logo.

The disputed domain name <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> was used to redirect Internet users to a domain name <pay-pagoseguro-checkout-carritofinal-seguro.shop> which hosted a generic e-commerce website named "Modern Hogar".

This clearly disrupts the Complainant's business and shows that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes bad faith use.

The disputed domain name <carrefour-ar.store> did not resolve to an active website; however, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names support the finding that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to file a Response and therefore failed to present any evidence of any good faith

registration and use with regard to the disputed domain names clearly prove that the disputed domain names were registered and are used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

## **8. 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 names <carrefour-ar.com>, <carrefour-arg.com>, <carrefour-arg.store>, <carrefour-ar.store>, and <pay-carrefour-seguro-checkout-argentina.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Peter Burgstaller/*

**Peter Burgstaller**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2025