

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Carrefour SA. v. sam del  
Case No. D2025-2705

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is sam del, France.

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

The disputed domain name <carrefourbanque-verif.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc. (the “First Registrar”).

The disputed domain name <carrefour-banqueverif.com> is registered with Hello Internet Corp (the “Second Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 9, 2025. On July 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 10, 2025, the First 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, Whoisprotection.cc) and contact information in the Complaint. On July 11, 2025, the Second 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 July 11, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrars, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 14, 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 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Louis-Bernard Buchman as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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, a company registered in France and listed on the Paris Stock Exchange, pioneered in 1968 the creation of the first hypermarkets and has since grown to become one of the world leaders in retail goods sales. In 2024, it operated over 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide, with global net sales of EUR 85.4 billion. Besides retail, the Complainant offers banking, insurance, ticketing and travel services.

The Complainant owns a very large portfolio of trademarks containing the element CARREFOUR, including the French trademark CARREFOUR, registered under No. 1487274 on September 2, 1988, and the French trademark CARREFOUR, registered under No. 1565338 on December 8, 1989 (together hereinafter referred to as: "the Carrefour Mark").

Another relevant trademark owned by the Complainant and containing the elements "carrefour" and "banque" is the French trademark CARREFOUR BANQUE & ASSURANCE, registered under No. 3585950 on July 2, 2008 (hereinafter referred to as: "the Carrefour Banque Mark").

The Carrefour Mark and the Carrefour Banque Mark hereinafter referred to as: "the Marks".

The Complainant also owns the <carrefour.com> domain name, registered on October 25, 1995, and many other domain names related to its activities, incorporating the element "carrefour", including the <carrefour-banque.fr> domain name, registered on October 7, 2009.

The disputed domain name <carrefourbanque-verif.com> was registered on June 29, 2025, whereas the disputed domain name <carrefour-banqueverif.com> was registered on July 5, 2025.

The disputed domain names resolved to blocked pages displaying a dangerous site warning. At the time of this decision, they do not resolve to any active website.

#### **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 reproduce the Carrefour Mark and the Carrefour Banque Mark, in which it has rights, and is confusingly similar to the Marks insofar as the disputed domain names contain the Marks and that the element "verif" after the Marks (whether or not preceded by a hyphen) is not capable to prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Marks remain recognizable in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names and never had any affiliation with the Complainant (which never authorized the Respondent to use the Marks in any manner).

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent had knowledge of the Marks and registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, and is also using them in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural Aspects – Failure to Respond**

As aforementioned, no Response was received from the Respondent.

Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a default by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint.

The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstance in this case which would cause the Panel to proceed differently.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, it is the Complainant's burden to establish that all three of the required criteria for a transfer of the disputed domain names have been met, even in the event of a default.

Under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel is empowered to draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate under the circumstances.

In this case, the Panel finds that as a result of the default, the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant. In particular, by defaulting and failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, such as making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Moreover, as discussed below, the Respondent has failed to provide any exculpatory information or reasoning that might have led the Panel to question the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted in bad faith.

### **6.2. Requirements of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy**

#### **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 Marks and the disputed domain names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 that the Marks are recognizable within the disputed domain names.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition in the disputed domain names of another term, such as “verif” (a commonly used abbreviation of the word “verification”), may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Regarding the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” in the disputed domain names, it is well established that a gTLD does not generally affect the assessment of a domain name for the purpose of determining identity or confusingly similarity. [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.

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. 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. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered and Used 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 Carrefour Mark and the composition of the disputed domain names.

In particular, the Panel notes that the distinctiveness and reputation of the Carrefour Mark have been confirmed by many prior UDRP panels (see for instance *Carrefour v. Yunjinhua*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0257](#); *Carrefour v. Park KyeongSook*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1425](#); *Carrefour v. VistaPrint Technologies Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0769](#); *Carrefour v. WhoisGuard, Inc.*, *WhoisGuard Protected / Robert Jurek, Katrin Kafut, Purchasing clerk, Starship Tapes & Records*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-2533](#); *Carrefour v. Jane Casares, NA*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0976](#); *Carrefour v. Jean-Pierre Andre Preca*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-](#)

[2857](#); *Carrefour v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2610](#); *Carrefour v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0155401638 / Binya Rteam*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2895](#) and *Carrefour SA v. Jamyz Baleck, Beneld Liis*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1491](#)).

Furthermore, some UDRP panels have held that in certain circumstances, registrants of domain names have a duty to abstain from registering and using a domain name, which is either identical or confusingly similar to a prior trademark held by others and which would infringe upon or otherwise violate the rights of a third party. See Policy, paragraph 2(b); *Nike, Inc. v. B. B. de Boer*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1397](#); *Nuplex Industries Limited v. Nuplex*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0078](#); *Mobile Communication Service Inc. v. WebReg, RN*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1304](#); *BOUYGUES v. Chengzhang, Lu Ciagao*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1325](#); *Media General Communications, Inc. v. Rarenames, WebReg*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0964](#); and *mVisible Technologies, Inc. v. Navigation Catalyst Systems, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1141](#).

Regarding the composition of the disputed domain names, the Panel notes that both include the word “banque” (meaning “bank” in French) after the element “carrefour”, and finds it beyond doubt, in the light of the Complainant’s Carrefour Banque Mark and of its banking activity in France (where the Respondent appears to be located), that the Respondent knowingly violated the above-mentioned duty by registering the disputed domain names.

As a consequence, the Panel finds 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.

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

## 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-banqueverif.com> and <carrefourbanque-verif.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Louis-Bernard Buchman/

**Louis-Bernard Buchman**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 15, 2025