

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA, Atacadão - Distribuição, Comércio E Indústria LTDA. v. adam adn, Emily Mcdowell
Case No. D2025-2706

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Carrefour SA, France, and Atacadão - Distribuição, Comércio E Indústria LTDA., Brazil (hereinafter the “Complainant”), represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondents are adam adn, Türkiye and, Emily Mcdowell, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carrefourae.store> and <carrefourtr.shop> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”). The disputed domain names <carrefoursafirsatindirim.shop> and <carrefoursafirsat.shop> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 9, 2025. On July 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 11, 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 Respondents (Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) and Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) 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 Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 11, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on August 7, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a worldwide leader in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1968. With a turnaround of 76 billion euros in 2018, the Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40). The Complainant operates more than 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide.

The Complainant is the holder of a number of trademarks for CARREFOUR, including the International trademark CARREFOUR No. 008779498, registered on July 13, 2010, duly renewed, and designating goods in international class 35; the International trademark CARREFOUR No. 1010661, registered on April 16, 2009, duly renewed and designating services in international class 35; the French trademark CARREFOUR No. 1565338 registered on May 25, 1990, duly renewed and designating services in classes 1-34 of goods and services.

The Complainant has registered the domain name <carrefour.fr> since June 23, 2005.

The disputed domain names were registered between June 16, 2025 to June 20, 2025 and they resolve to landing pages of the Registrar, except for the disputed domain name <carrefourtr.shop>, which resolves to an error page.

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 highly similar to its earlier trademark CARREFOUR, as the disputed domain names include the trademark CARREFOUR, with the addition of generic terms such as ISO country codes "TR" and "AE" (for Türkiye and United Arab Emirates), as well as the Turkish words "safirsat" (which means "sapphire sale") and "safirsatindirim" (which means "sapphire sale discount"). The addition of such terms increases the risk of confusion in the mind of the average Internet user, because these terms are directly linked to the Complainant's commercial activity.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondents have never been authorized by the Complainant to use the trademark CARREFOUR in any manner. The Respondents are not a partner, distributor or licensee of the Complainant, and there is no contractual or commercial relationship between the Complainant and the Respondents which could eventually legitimate the registration and use of the disputed domain names by the Respondent. The Complainant has found no evidence whatsoever that the Respondents are known by the disputed domain names. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names were not associated with any active website and they either resolved to error pages or to standard landing pages.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant submits that its trademarks are intensively used in numerous countries worldwide, such as France, Spain, Italy and Brazil for instance, but also Türkiye and United Arab Emirates. The Complainant enjoys solid notoriety in these countries, the first CARREFOUR trademark being registered in 1968. The composition of the disputed domain names suggests an affiliation

with the Complainant's trademark, and by doing so mislead Internet users. As regards the use, the disputed domain names are currently not actively used and resolve to standard/error pages, but the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Moreover, given the notoriety of the trademark CARREFOUR of the Complainant, and the number of trademark rights owned by the Complainant, it is hard to imagine that the Respondents could use the disputed domain names in good faith in the future.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, claiming that there is sufficient connection between all the disputed domain names whether in terms of their naming composition, date of registration, disclosed registrant information or use.

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 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.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that (i) the disputed domain names were registered in a very short time frame, between June 16, 2025 to June 20, 2025; (ii) the disputed domain names share a similar naming pattern, reproducing the Complainant's CARREFOUR name and trademark, together with other terms relating to countries or which relate to the Complainant's business activities; (iii) the email addresses of the registrants are provided by Gmail and share a similar naming pattern (i.e. name+number@gmail.com); (iv) none of the disputed domain names was associated with an active website at the date of the Complaint; (v) one of the domain name registrants is allegedly residing in Türkiye, and one of the domain names held by the other registrant includes "tr" in the domain name composition, which stands for Türkiye. Moreover, none of the named Respondents have challenged the Complainant's contention that the underlying registrant of all disputed domain names is the same person and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control.

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.

6.2. Substantive matters

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the

case. See section 4.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 the trademark CARREFOUR 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domains 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, "ae", "tr", "safirsatindirim" and "safirsat") 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case ".shop" and ".store", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy, the disputed domain names were inactive at the date of the Complaint and therefore not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or for a legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use of the domain names. The disputed domain name <carrefourtr.shop> resolves at the date of this Decision to a website purporting to offer for sale various electronic goods, at discounted prices, with no indication or disclosure of the relationship with the Complainant (or lack thereof). Such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute a fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Panel notes that the Respondent has provided registration details of “adam adn” and “Emily Mcdowell” for the disputed domain names; there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

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.

In this case, according to the unrebutted assertions of the Complainant, its CARREFOUR trademark was widely used in commerce well before the registration of the disputed domain names: few of the Complainant’s trademarks date back to 1968, some 57 years before the registration of the disputed domain names, and the Complainant has registered the domain name <carrefour.com> that resolves to its main website since 1995. The reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks is clearly established. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks. Some of them include the terms the “indirim” which means, according to the unrebutted assertions of the Complainant, “discount” in Turkish, and “safirsat” which means “sapphire sale” (“safir” means “sapphire” in Turkish and “sat” means “sale” in Turkish). The Panel accepts that these terms are associated with the trademark CARREFOUR, also known for retailing and sales activities. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the confusingly similar disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names were inactive at the date of the Complaint. Panels 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and 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.

Moreover, the disputed domain name <carrefourtr.shop> resolves at the date of the Decision to an e-commerce website. By reproducing the CARREFOUR trademark in the above-mentioned disputed domain name, with no disclaimer as to the Respondent’s lack of relationship with the Complainant, the Respondent suggests at least the association with the Complainant. There is thus little doubt that the Respondent intended to earn profit from the confusion created with Internet users. In consequence, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names deliberately in order to take advantage of the Complainant’s reputation and to give credibility to its operations.

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 <carrefourae.store>, <carrefoursafirsatindirim.shop>, <carrefoursafirsat.shop> and <carrefourtr.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: August 11, 2025