

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. 曾嘉威 (Jiawei Zeng)

Case No. D2025-2882

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is 曾嘉威 (Jiawei Zeng), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefourstore.top> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co.,Ltd (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 21, 2025. On July 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 11, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 13, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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

Since 1968, Complainant has been in the retail business. With a revenue of EUR 84.9 billion in 2023, Complainant operates over 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide, with over 500,000 employees worldwide and millions of daily visitors in its stores. Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services.

Complainant owns several hundred trademark rights worldwide with the CARREFOUR mark, either alone or in combination with other terms, for example:

- International Trademark Registration No. 351147 for the CARREFOUR word mark, registered on October 2, 1968;
- International Trademark Registration No. 353849 for the CARREFOUR word mark, registered on February 28, 1969; and
- European Union registered trademark No. 005178371 for the CARREFOUR word mark, registered on August 30, 2007.

In addition, Complainant owns numerous domain names which include the CARREFOUR mark, such as <carrefour.com>, which has been registered since 1995, <carrefour.fr> which has been registered since 2005.

The Domain Name was registered on July 8, 2025 and at the time of filing of the Complaint, resolved to a website in the Indonesian language that displayed Complainant's trademarks and offered content related to e-commerce and seemingly a "contact us" link. The website also contained a copyright notice in the name of "Carrefour E-Commerce Global."

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for CARREFOUR and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known CARREFOUR products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes Complainant's trademarks, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") states that failure to respond to the complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the CARREFOUR trademarks, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the CARREFOUR trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the CARREFOUR trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which it was registered (in this case, is ".top") is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's CARREFOUR trademarks. These CARREFOUR trademarks are recognizable in the Domain Name.

In particular, the Domain Name's inclusion of Complainant's CARREFOUR trademarks in their entirety, with an addition of the term "store", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the CARREFOUR trademarks. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademarks and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the CARREFOUR trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating these trademarks. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the CARREFOUR trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the record shows that the Domain Name resolved to a website that displayed Complainant's trademarks and offered content that implied that it is operated, authorized by or affiliated with Complainant.

Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot under the circumstances confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

"(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location."

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the CARREFOUR trademarks long predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's CARREFOUR trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized. Therefore, Respondent was more likely than not aware of the CARREFOUR trademarks when it registered the Domain Name. See section 3.2.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Moreover, the Domain Name's inclusion of Complainant's trademark CARREFOUR in its entirety with an addition of the term "store", further reflects the awareness that Respondent had of Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration. Such adoption of Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name illustrates Respondent's effort to mislead Internet users as to the Domain Name's association with Complainant.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. As noted above, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a website that displayed Complainant's trademarks and offered content that falsely implied that it is operated, authorized by or affiliated with Complainant, with the intent to mislead Internet users into believing that the Domain Name and the website it resolved to, is operated by or affiliated with Complainant, which is bad faith.

In the present circumstances, considering the distinctiveness and reputation of the CARREFOUR trademarks, the failure of Respondent to submit a response, and particularly noting the Domain Name clearly targeted Complainant, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <carrefourstore.top> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025