

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Hakki Dalik, Omer Ertan, omerinc, Deniz Ifadesiz, baran ekiet
Case No. D2025-3220

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Hakki Dalik, Omer Ertan, omerinc, Deniz Ifadesiz, baran ekiet, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carreffourso.online>, <carreffoursa.com>, <carreffoursa.live>, <carreffour-sa.online>, <carreffourso.store> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 12, 2025. On August 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 12, 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 Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph

5, the due date for Response was September 15, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 an international retailer employing hypermarkets concept since 1968. With a turnaround of EUR 76 billion 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. With more than 384,000 employees worldwide and 1.3 million daily unique visitors in its stores, the Complainant is an international retail player. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services.

The Complainant owns several hundred registrations of its trademark rights in various jurisdiction in the "carrefour" term, for instance: International trademark registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, and International trademark registration No. 1010661, registered on April 16, 2009, designating also Türkiye.

Directly or through its subsidiaries, the Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names identical to, or comprising, its trademarks, both within generic and country code Top-Level Domains ("gTLD" and "ccTLD"). For instance, <carrefour.com> has been registered since 1995 and <carrefour.com.br> since 1997. The Complainant is also present at the Facebook social network with about 11 million "likes" of the network's users.

The disputed name <carrefffourso.online> was registered on July 14, 2025.

The disputed name <carreffoursa.com> was registered on July 19, 2025.

The disputed name <carreffoursa.live> was registered on July 28, 2025

The disputed name <carrefour-sa.online> was registered on July 17, 2025.

The disputed name <carreffourso.store> was registered on July 12, 2025.

The disputed domain names do not resolve to any active websites.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain names are highly similar to the earlier well-known Complainant's trademark. The only difference between the disputed domain names and the earlier Complainant's trademark lies in the repetition of letter "f" and the addition of the elements "so" or "sa". It is established case law that the omission of a letter or a misspelling of a trademark in a domain name does nothing to diminish the likelihood of confusion arising from that domain name. The use of lower-case letter

format on the one hand and the addition of the top-level domains on the other hand, are not significant in determining whether the domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the trademark of the Complainant. The disputed domain names imitate the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have acquired no trademark in the name CARREFOUR which could have granted the Respondents rights in the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondents have been commonly known by the disputed domain names as an individual, business, or other organization. This statement is reinforced by the fact that the Complainant filed the present Complaint soon after the registration of the disputed domain names, intending to not allow the Respondents to be commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not authorized the use of the terms "carrefour" or terms similar thereto in the disputed domain names in any manner or form. The Respondents have not, before the original filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the disputed domain names in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, all disputed domain names resolve to error pages.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant and its trademarks were so widely well-known, that it is inconceivable that the Respondents ignored the Complainant or its earlier rights on the term CARREFOUR. The Respondents had the Complainant's name and trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain names. The Respondents choice of the disputed domain names cannot have been accidental and must have been influenced by the fame of the Complainant and its earlier trademark. The Respondents chose the disputed domain names because of their identity with or similarity to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and legitimate interest. This was done in the hope and expectation that Internet users searching for the Complainant's services and products would instead come across the disputed domain names. The Respondents acquired and are using the disputed domain names to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain names. By registering five disputed domain names, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of behavior which unequivocally shows that he knew of the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. 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.

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 or corresponding websites 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 the disputed domain names were registered only a few days apart and with the same registrar, the disputed domain names are delegated to the same name servers, and share the same structure: “Carrefour” mistyped + “sa” or “so”, all registrant countries are Türkiye, and most registrant cities are “Kocaeli”.

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.

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

While the addition of other terms here, “so” in <carrefffourso.online> and <carrefffourso.store>, “sa” in <carrefffoursa.com>, <carrefffoursa.live> and <carrefffour-sa.online>, and “-” in <carrefffour-sa.online> 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.

A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. The Panel considers the disputed domain names consisting of intentional misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark by using double “ff” in the disputed domain names compared to single “f” in the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The applicable generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards gTLD “.com”, “.online”, “.live”, “.store” for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 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 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.

The available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones, TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise agree for use of its prior registered trademarks by the Respondent, thus no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain names could be reasonably claimed (see, *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#)).

The Respondent has no right or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names resolving to an inactive website (see *Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Daniele Tornatore*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1302](#)).

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark. The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. The Panel is convinced that the Complainant's trademark is well established through long and widespread use and the Complainant has acquired a significant reputation and level of goodwill in its trademark both in France and internationally. Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark were registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 (i) the high degree of reputation of the Complainant's trademark, (ii) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the Respondent's concealing its identity while registering the disputed domain names, and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. In this regard, the Panel notes in particular the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain names, which further supports a finding of bad faith.

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 <carreffourso.online>, <carreffoursa.com>, <carreffoursa.live>, <carreffour-sa.online>, <carreffourso.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: October 6, 2025