

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Name Redacted

Case No. D2025-2932

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Name Redacted,¹ Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefoursas.site> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 23, 2025 naming the Registrar as the Respondent. On July 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing the name of the Registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name held by it, which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint as filed. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 29, 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 31, 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”).

¹ The actual Registrant of the disputed domain name may have used the name of a third party when registering it. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the name used by the Registrant from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name used by the Registrant. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the Order in this proceeding, and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

The Center formally notified the amended Complaint to the Registrant under the name and with the contact details provided by the Registrar, and the proceedings commenced on August 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2025.

On August 13, 2025, the Center received an email purporting to be from a person with the same name as the Registrant, which stated that this was the first time they had been made aware of this matter and that they had never registered, used or had any involvement with the disputed domain name. They said that their name, address and other contact details appeared in the Whois record without their knowledge or consent. However, on August 29, 2025, the Registrar emailed the Center stating that its investigation had revealed that the owner of the disputed domain name is a person with the same name as recorded in the data held by it and provided to the Center. No further Response was received by the Center.

The term “Respondent” is used below to refer to the actual Registrant, whatever may be their name, in line with the Panel’s finding below that the Respondent is the actual Registrant, whether named correctly or not in the amended Complaint.

The Center appointed Jonathan Turner as the sole panelist in this matter on September 10, 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 major retailer established in France and now operating more than 12,000 stores in over 30 countries, with more than 384,000 employees and sales of over 87 billion EUR in 2024. Even in 2018, several years before the disputed domain name was registered, the Complainant had a turnover of 76 billion euros. Daily unique visitors to its stores top 1.3 million and millions of people have liked its pages on social media.

The Complainant has registered CARREFOUR as a word mark in the European Union under no. 008779498 in class 35 with registration date July 13, 2010 and application date December 23, 2009; in France under no. 1565338 in classes 1-34 with registration date May 25, 1990 and application date December 8, 1989; and in the United States of America under no. 6763415 in class 35 with registration date June 21, 2022 and application date December 8, 2020. The Complainant has also registered CARREFOUR as a figurative mark in a large number of countries by an international registration under no. 563304 in classes 1-42 with registration and application date November 6, 1990.

The Complainant is also the registrant of domain names containing “carrefour” including <carrefour.com> and <carrefour.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 21, 2025, and returns an error page on the worldwide web.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant’s primary mark, CARREFOUR, and generic terms, is thus confusingly similar to that mark, in which it has registered rights.

The Complainant also states that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the mark or to register the disputed domain name, that it has searched for and not found any evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has not used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name for any bona offering of goods or services. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has not acquired any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is very likely to have known of the Complainant's use of the mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, given the scale of the Complainant's use of the mark and its reputation. The Complainant also contends that it is hard to imagine any bona fide use of the mark. The Complainant infers that the Respondent registered the mark in bad faith and is passively using it in bad faith.

B. Respondent

As stated above, the Respondent requested that the Complaint be dismissed but did not make any substantive reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identity of the Respondent and Notification of the Complaint

The Panel considers that the Respondent is the actual Registrant of the disputed domain name, this being the intended target of the Complaint, whether or not they have been named correctly in the amended Complaint. Having reviewed the file, the Panel further finds that the amended Complaint has been duly notified to the Respondent in accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4.

B. 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown that it has registered rights in the mark CARREFOUR for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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

The Complainant's mark is accompanied in the disputed domain name only by generic terms, namely the standard acronym "sas" for a common type of French company and the generic top level domain, ".site". The Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.8 and 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds on the undisputed evidence that the Respondent has not made any bona fide offering of goods or services under the disputed domain name nor any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of it; that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and that the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use or register it.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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, the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s very extensive use of the mark CARREFOUR and reputation under it. The Panel also accepts the Complainant’s submission that it is difficult to imagine any bona fide use of the disputed domain name, given that it consists of the Complainant’s mark and solely generic elements. On this basis the Panel infers that the Respondent’s registration and any use of it have been in bad faith.

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 reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 name <carrefoursas.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonathan Turner/

Jonathan Turner

Sole Panelist

Date: September 24, 2025