

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc
Case No. D2025-2074

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carfour.bio> is registered with CommuniGal Communication Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 26, 2025. On May 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 29, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 30, 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 30, 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 R. Eric Gaum as the sole panelist in this matter on June 27, 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 multinational retail and wholesaling corporation that operates a variety of store formats including hypermarkets, supermarkets, convenience stores, and cash & carry stores. The Complainant also offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in different jurisdictions, including the following:

- International Trademark CARREFOUR No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, duly renewed, and designating goods in international classes 1 to 34;
- International Trademark CARREFOUR No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, duly renewed, and designating services in international classes 35 to 42;
- European Union Trademark CARREFOUR No. 5178371, registered on August 30, 2007, duly renewed, and designating goods and services in international classes 9, 35, and 38; and
- France Trademark CARREFOUR BIO No. 4641519, registered on April 23, 2020, and designating goods and services in international classes 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 35.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names identical to, or comprising, its trademarks, both within generic and country code Top-Level Domains. For instance, <carrefour.com> has been registered since 1995, <carrefour.fr> since 2005, and <carrefour.bio> since 2014.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 8, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website with pay-per-click (“PPC”) links. According to the Complaint, navigation towards the disputed domain name triggers security alerts with the following warning message: “You’ve visited illegal infected website. You have visited unsafe site with illegal content. Your PC is at risk of being infected by viruses.”

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 the following:

The Complainant is a worldwide leader in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1968. With a revenue of EUR 84,9 billion in 2023, the Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40). The Complainant operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide. With more than 500,000 employees worldwide and millions of daily unique visitors in its stores, the Complainant is without a doubt a major and well-known worldwide leader in retail. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier well-known CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR BIO trademarks. Both trademarks are immediately recognizable in the disputed domain name (with, or without, the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”)) despite a minor misspelling consisting of the omission of the letters “re” which, in any case, does not alter the overall impression given by the disputed domain name, nor the way it is pronounced.

The Complainant has already been targeted by the Respondent’s typosquatting activity (*Carrefour SA v. Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4560](#), and it is well established that “a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element”).

The disputed domain name imitates the Complainant's trademarks. These trademarks are immediately recognizable in the disputed domain name therefore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier trademarks.

The Respondent in this administrative proceeding is unknown at the time of the original filing of the Complaint. Further to the Center's Notice of Registrant Information, the Respondent was identified as Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc., a Respondent which has been cited in a substantial number of UDRP proceedings. The Complainant contends that the Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Firstly, the Complainant performed searches and found no "carfour" trademark owned by the Respondent. Secondly, the Respondent imitates the Complainant's earlier registered trademarks in the disputed domain name without any license or authorization from the Complainant. Thirdly, the Respondent has not, before the original filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services. In fact, navigation to the disputed domain name triggers a series of security alerts and warning messages, e.g., "This site was blocked because it may contain unsafe content that can harm your device or compromise your personal info." There is also evidence of the Respondent's intent to target the Complainant and to capitalize on the reputation of the well-known CARREFOUR trademark for its own profit, through the display of PPC links on the disputed domain name that directly refer to the Complainant's business.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons: (1) the Complainant and its trademarks are so widely well-known that it is inconceivable that the Respondent ignored the Complainant and its earlier rights; (2) that it is highly likely that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name because of its similarity to the Complainant's trademarks; (3) the Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain name; (4) the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website containing potentially harmful material or used for illegal content; (5) the Respondent has not provided accurate information when it registered the disputed domain name and/or used a privacy protection service to conceal its real identity; and (6) the Respondent has been involved in a substantial number of similar UDRP proceedings in the past.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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. Here the disputed domain name is an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademarks, which is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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.

Nor is there any evidence in the record that indicates that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has ever had any noncommercial legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The unrebutted record demonstrates that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is on a webpage blocked because it may contain unsafe content that can harm the device or compromise personal information.

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 and is using the disputed domain name despite the Complainant and its trademarks being well-known, and where the Complainant’s trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Respondent also uses the disputed domain name in connection with a website displaying PPC links. Navigation towards the disputed domain name triggers security alerts which indicate the website contains potentially harmful material or used for illegal content. In addition, the Respondent has not provided accurate information when it registered the disputed domain name and used a privacy protection service to conceal its real identity. Finally, the Respondent has a history of having been found to have registered and used domain names in similar UDRP proceedings in the past.

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.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website with PPC links, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity here, claimed provision of unsafe content, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, 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 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 <carfour.bio> be transferred to the Complainant.

/R. Eric Gaum/

R. Eric Gaum

Sole Panelist

Date: July 11, 2025