

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Heloise Antonella Galvao, Erik Gestor, Empresa Original da Sena Ltda, Rodolfo Pereira, Ronald Laticionios Ltda
Case No. D2025-2273

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Heloise Antonella Galvao, Erik Gestor, Empresa Original da Sena Ltda, and Rodolfo Pereira, Ronald Laticionios Ltda, Brazil.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carrefourpascoa.shop>, <pascoacarrefour.shop>, and <semanacarrefour.online> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2025. On June 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 13, 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 (“Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)”) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 16, 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 June 16, 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 worldwide operator of retail and hypermarkets starting in 1968. The Complainant operates more than 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide and additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services. The Complainant that is listed on the Paris Stock Exchange has more than 384,000 employees worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks for CARREFOUR worldwide including:

- International trademark registration No. 351147, CARREFOUR (word), registered on October 2, 1968, for goods in international classes 1 to 34;
- International trademark registration No. 353849, CARREFOUR (word), registered on February 28, 1969, for services in international classes 35 to 42;
- Brazilian trademark registration No. 006314210, CARREFOUR (word), registered on May 10, 1976, for services in international class 38.

The disputed domain name <carrefourpascoa.shop> was registered on April 13, 2024. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not appear to be used actively. The disputed domain name <pascoacarrefour.shop>, was registered on April 20, 2024. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an error page with the message "This store is unavailable". The disputed domain name <semanacarrefour.online> was registered on April 9, 2024. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain names did not appear to be used actively.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its well-known trademark CARREFOUR, as they contain the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the terms "pascoa" and "semana", which respectively is Portuguese for the English terms "easter" and "week".

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark in any manner. Moreover, there is no evidence that either of the Respondents has been commonly known by the disputed domain names as an individual, business, or other organization, just as it is evident that the Respondents are not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services in the disputed domain names.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Complainant and its trademarks are so widely well-known that it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant or its earlier rights to the CARREFOUR mark. The Complainant thus states that the

Respondent acquired the disputed domain names to give the impression that he or she is affiliated with the Complainant. As to the bad faith use of the disputed domain names, the Complainant contends that the fact that they are not actively used on the web, that the nonuse of a domain name does not prevent the finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to three nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules since the Complainant thus believes that the disputed domain names are under common control, inter alia since they are registered to the same Registrar and were registered around the same time.

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.

The Complainant claims: (i) all the disputed domain names follow the same pattern of "Carrefour" + terms that are linked to seasonal promotions made by the Complainant for its retailing activities during this period; (ii) all registrant information show that the Respondents are located in Brazil; and (iii) the name given and organization names are most likely fake.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the above and that all three disputed domain names are registered to the same Registrar, and that they were registered around the same time.

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.

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.

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 entirety of the CARREFOUR mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “pascoa” and “samana” respectively, 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 under the Policy.

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.

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 names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and have not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and its trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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 given the circumstances of the case, in particular the extent of use and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark CARREFOUR, it is inconceivable to the Panel in the current circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant’s marks. Further, the Panel finds that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the fact that the disputed domain names it chose could attract Internet users in a manner that is likely to create confusion for such users.

The fact that the disputed domain names are not currently used actively does not prevent the finding of bad faith use. As it is stated in section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): “From the inception of the UDRP, panelists 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.”

Noting that the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's distinctive and reputed trademark CARREFOUR, that the Respondent has failed to come forward with any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and that there appears to be no conceivable good faith use that could be made by the Respondent of the disputed domain names, and considering all the facts and evidence of the case, the Panel finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy are also fulfilled.

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 names <carrefourpascoa.shop>, <pascoacarrefour.shop> and <semanacarrefour.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2025