

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. hf hf
Case No. D2025-1383

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is hf hf, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefoursamarket.shop> 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 April 4, 2025. On April 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 8, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 8, 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 April 9, 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 April 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 Carrefour SA, an established actor in the retail sector credited with introducing the hypermarket model in 1968. It operates more than 12,000 stores in over 30 countries and employs approximately 384,000 people worldwide. Its stores receive around 1.3 million unique visitors each day. In 2018, the Complainant's turnover reached EUR 76 billion.

The Complainant owns hundreds of trademark rights worldwide, including the following:

- European Union trademark No. 008779498, CARREFOUR, registered on July 13, 2010;
- International trademark registration No. 563304, CARREFOUR, registered on November 6, 1990;
- United States of America ("United States") trademark No. 6763415, CARREFOUR, registered on June 21, 2022.

The Complainant owns and uses numerous domain names incorporating its trademark, including:

- <carrefour.com>
- <carrefour.fr>

These domain names are used to promote the Complainant's brand, products and services.

The Complainant maintains a substantial presence on social media. Its official Facebook page has over 11 million likes, its TikTok account is followed by nearly 6.2 million users, and its Instagram profile by more than 740,000. The Complainant is widely known under the Complainant's mark and strongly associated with retail services.

The disputed domain name <carrefoursamarket.shop> was registered on March 5, 2025. It has remained inactive since registration and currently resolves to a default parking page provided by the Hosting provider. No further information is available regarding the Respondent.

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 its mark, incorporating it in full with only the additions "sa" and "market". According to the Complainant, "sa" is a common abbreviation for Société Anonyme (a French corporate designation), and "market" is a generic term indicating a retail space.

The Complainant states it has never authorised the Respondent's use or registration of its mark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, not known by the disputed domain name, and holds no relevant trademark rights. No commercial or contractual relationship exists to justify the registration.

The disputed domain name resolves to a default Registrar parking page without any evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services. Thus, the Complainant contends the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further highlights its mark's longstanding international recognition. Given the disputed domain name's composition and basic search results, the Complainant argues the Respondent must have known of its rights at the time of registration, deliberately targeting its mark.

The disputed domain name has remained inactive since registration. In the absence of any legitimate purpose, the Complainant submits that such non-use supports a finding of bad faith registration and use and that any future use would inevitably exploit the Complainant's reputation illegitimately.

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

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, such as "sa" and "market", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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 3.0](#), 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 Respondent is neither a licensee of the Complainant nor otherwise affiliated with it, and there is no indication that the Complainant has ever authorised the use of its mark in a domain name or for any other purpose. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or holds any relevant trademark rights.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark combined with the elements "sa", referring to a French corporate form, and "market", a descriptive term closely related to the Complainant's field of activity. In this context, the composition of the disputed domain name may give the misleading impression of an official association with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name resolves to a default holding page provided by the hosting provider and there is no indication of any bona fide offering of goods or services, or any legitimate use. In view of these circumstances and taking into account the established reputation of the Complainant's mark, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 registered the disputed domain name by incorporating the Complainant's well-known mark alongside the descriptive terms "sa" and "market". In the context of the Complainant's retail activities, this combination likely suggests an official commercial platform. The use of the ".shop" Top-Level Domain further reinforces this impression, directly relating to the Complainant's business sector.

The disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant acquired rights in its mark. It is not substantively used and currently resolves to a static hosting-provider page. No evidence of preparatory activity indicating a legitimate purpose exists, nor has the Respondent explained its choice of domain name.

Considering these circumstances – the disputed domain name composition, the commerce-related Top-Level Domain, and the established reputation of the Complainant's mark – the Panel finds it likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with awareness of the Complainant's rights.

The lack of active use and absence of plausible justification further support a finding of registration and holding in bad faith.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds 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.

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 <carrefoursamarket.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: May 19, 2025