

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CARREFOUR SA v. Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd.

Case No. D2025-2635

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd., Iceland.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <carrefour-seguro.app> (the “First Domain Name”) is registered with TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd. The disputed domain name <carrefourseguro.com> (the “Second Domain Name”) is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the “Registrars”). The disputed domain names are together referred to in this decision as the “Domain Names”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 4, 2025. On July 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On July 7 and 14, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 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 July 21, 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 July 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Wolter Wefers Bettink as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 leader in the retail business with a turnover of EUR 76 billion in 2018, operating more than 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide, with more than 384,000 employees worldwide and 1,3 million daily unique visitors in its stores. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, or ticketing services. The Complainant's Facebook page is currently "liked" by more than 11 million Internet users, with almost 6,2 million Internet users "liking" the Complainant's TikTok account and more than 740,000 followers on the Complainant's Instagram account.

The Complainant owns a number of trade mark rights worldwide, including (hereafter the "Trade Marks"):

- European Union trade mark CARREFOUR No. 008779498, registered on July 13, 2010;
- International trade mark CARREFOUR No. 563304, registered on November 6, 1990;
- French trade mark CARREFOUR No. 1565338, registered on December 8, 1989;
- United States trade mark CARREFOUR No. 6763415, registered on June 21, 2022.

The First Domain Name was registered on June 2, 2025. The Second Domain Name was registered on June 5, 2025.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes for the Domain Names, pursuant to the Rules, Paragraph 4(f) and refers to the registered respondents in the Amended Complaint as 'the Respondent'. This term will also be used throughout this decision to refer to the registrants together. To the extent necessary, the argumentation of the Complainant on consolidation will be discussed below under 6.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Names.

In particular, the Complainant contends the following.

The Domain Names include the earlier Complainant's Trade Marks and differ only by the addition of the word "seguro", the Spanish word for insurance and a hyphen for the First Domain Name. Adding a descriptive or generic term to a trade mark in a domain name is not sufficient to avoid misleading Internet users and to avoid creating a likelihood and confusion with the Trade Marks, which clearly stand out in the Domain Names. As the Complainant also sells insurance services, the addition of this term adds to the likelihood of confusion. The generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLD") ".com" and ".app" should not be taken into consideration when evaluating the risk of confusing similarity. Therefore, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Marks.

The Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names, since:

- the Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to use the Trade Marks in any manner;
- the Complainant never gave consent for the registration of the Domain Names;

- the Respondent is not a partner, distributor or licensee of the Complainant, and there is no contractual or commercial relationship between them.

In addition, the Complainant performed searches on the Internet and found no CARREFOUR trade mark owned by the Respondent, while it has found no evidence that the Respondent is known by the Domain Names.

Furthermore, the Respondent has not, before the filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the Domain Names in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services. Both Domain Names resolve to an error page. This type of content, or lack of content, indicating the absence of good faith offering of goods or services (bona fide offering), does not evidence any legitimate interest of the Respondent in the use of the Domain Names.

In light of the above, the Complainant has demonstrated prima facie that the Respondent has no legitimate interests nor rights in the Domain Names, so that the burden of the production switches to the Respondent, which will have to demonstrate and evidence its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

The Complainant contends that the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith, since:

It is very likely that the Respondent knew the Trade Marks at the time of registration of the Domain Names, since:

- the Trade Marks are intensively used in numerous countries worldwide and enjoy a solid reputation in many countries;
- the first CARREFOUR Trade Mark has been registered in 1968, while the Domain Names have been registered in 2025;
- the Domain Names follow the same pattern of the CARREFOUR Trade Mark adding the term "seguro".

In addition, a simple search using an online search engine shows search results relating only to the Complainant and its Trade Marks.

This proves the knowledge of the Respondent of the Trade Marks at the time of registration of the Domain Names, so that these were registered in bad faith.

Furthermore, the Respondent is using the Domain Names in bad faith for the following reasons:

- the Domain Names have been inactive, suggesting that the Respondent intends to profit from or harm the Trade Marks, e.g., in order to disturb the Complainant's activities or to resell the Domain Names;
- by reproducing the Trade Marks in the Domain Names, the Respondent strengthens the incorrect impression that it is affiliated with the Complainant, making Internet users wrongly believe that they are visiting an official website of the Complainant, or affiliated to the Complainant;
- in view of the reputation of the Trade Marks it is hard to imagine any good faith use of the Domain Names in the future.

As a consequence, in the light of the above, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes for the Domain Names, pursuant to the Rules, Paragraph 4(f). However, the registrant as disclosed by the Registrar is, for both Domain Names, Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd., Iceland. Therefore, there is no need to consolidate the disputes as they concern the same Respondent.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown that it has registered rights in the Trade Marks. The Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Marks as they incorporate the CARREFOUR Trade Mark in its entirety. The addition of the term “seguro” in the Domain Names does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Trade Marks (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.8; see also, inter alia, *TPI Holdings, Inc. v. Carmen Armengol*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0361](#), and *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. John Mercier*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0980](#)). In addition, “seguro” is a Spanish word for insurance, one of the services of the Complainant. The gTLD “.app” and “.com” is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test, since it is a technical registration requirement ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Marks in which the Complainant has rights.

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.

Based on the evidence and the undisputed submissions of the Complainant, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has not received the Complainant’s authorization or consent to use the Trade Marks as part of the Domain Names, is not commonly known by the Domain Names, and has not acquired trade mark rights in the Domain Names. In addition, the Respondent’s use of the Domain Names does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Domain Names do not resolve to an active website and, by incorporating the Trade Marks, create the false impression of a relationship with or authorization by the Complainant. The fact that the Domain Names have so far been inactive, without an explanation from the Respondent, may suggest that the Respondent intends to profit from or harm the Trade Marks.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

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. This list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, leaves open that other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the undisputed information and the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Panel finds that at the time of registration of the Domain Names the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's Trade Marks, since:

- the registration of the Domain Names occurred some fifty-seven years after the registration of the earliest of the Trade Marks;
- the Trade Marks have a worldwide reputation, as evidenced, inter alia, by the more than 12,000 CARREFOUR stores in more than 30 countries and the 1.3 million daily unique visitors in the stores;
- a simple trade mark register search, or even an Internet search, prior to registration of the Domain Names would have informed the Respondent of the existence of the Trade Marks.

With regard to bad faith use, the fact that the Domain Names at this stage do not appear to resolve to an active website does not imply a lack of bad faith. As set out in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3, the consensus view is that the apparent lack of so-called active use (e.g., to resolve to a website) of a domain name without any active attempt to sell or to contact the trademark holder (passive holding), does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith (see *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#) and *HUGO BOSS Trade Mark Management GmbH & Co. KG, HUGO BOSS AG v. Dzianis Zakharenka*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0640](#)). In accordance with this UDRP jurisprudence, a UDRP panel must examine all the circumstances of the case to determine whether a respondent is acting in bad faith.

In this case, the Panel finds that the following circumstances together are found to be indicative of bad faith use of the Domain Name:

- the probability that the Respondent was aware or should have been aware of the Complainant's rights in the Trade Marks;
- the lack of a formal Response of the Respondent;
- the hiding by the Respondent of its identity through the use of a proxy domain registrar.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 <carrefour-seguro.app> and <carrefourseguro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wolter Wefers Bettink/

Wolter Wefers Bettink

Sole Panelist

Date: August 29, 2025