

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour v. jasonmiss and SilvaJo o
Case No. D2025-3305

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are jasonmiss, Brazil, and SilvaJo o, Brazil.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carrefourbetapp.com> and <carrefourjogo7.com> are registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 15, 2025. On August 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 19, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 19, 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 19, 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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. The Respondent jasonmiss sent an email communication to the Center on August 21, 2025, with the text “Parsing stopped”. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on September 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on September 25, 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.

The Respondent jasonmiss sent an email to the Center on September 25, 2025, with the text “The domain name is not mine”.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a retailer (also offering banking, insurance, travel and ticketing services) based in France. It developed the hypermarket concept in 1968 and is publicly listed on the Paris Stock Exchange. The Complainant operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries. With more than 500,000 employees worldwide and millions of daily visitors to its stores, the Complainant is a significant international retailer.

The Complainant owns numerous trade mark registrations worldwide for its CARREFOUR mark, including International trade mark No. 351147 for CARREFOUR registered on October 2, 1968, which is designated in several jurisdictions and Brazilian trade mark number 830532692 registered on December 26, 2012. The Complainant owns numerous domain names incorporating its CARREFOUR mark including <carrefour.com> which was registered in 1995 from which it operates its main website and <carrefour.com.br> which was registered in 1997. The Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark and business has a very considerable social media presence.

The disputed domain name <carrefourbetapp.com> was registered on July 20, 2025, and at the time of filing resolved to a website for on-line gambling in the Portuguese language which appears to be targeted at the Brazilian market. The disputed domain name <carrefourjogo7.com> was registered on July 21, 2025, and, while it currently resolves to an error page, the Complainant has provided in evidence a historical screenshot from July 28, 2025 of the page to which it resolved displaying a logo with the words “Carrefour Jogo” and images of dice and poker chips.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

In the present case, even though the disputed domain names are formally registered in the name of two different Respondents, the Complainant submits that several elements suggest that the two disputed domain names were registered by the same person or entity. Specifically, it notes the following:

- a) Registration Dates: The disputed domain names were registered just one day apart;
- b) Common Registrar: Both disputed domain names were registered through Name SRS AB;
- c) Common Top-Level Domain (“TLD”): Both disputed domain names are registered under the “.com” TLD;
- d) Common Naming Pattern: Both disputed domain names begin with “carrefour” and are followed by words related to gambling;
- e) Common Usage: Both disputed domain names have at one point, resolved to a website with a header displaying the CARREFOUR trade mark and images related to gambling;
- f) Mixture of Brazilian and non-Brazilian Contact Data: The registrant data confirmed by the Registrar for both disputed domain names indicates that the Respondents are based in Brazil, while specific fields among the contact data as identified by the Complainant contain values that appear to correspond to Asian countries and languages;
- g) Presumptively False Registration Data: Apart from the regional inconsistency described in the previous point, the Complainant submits that other values suggest that the registration of the disputed

domain names was carried out using fanciful and/or inaccurate contact information, in breach of the registration agreements, in particular: in particular for <carrefourbetapp.com> the address and city entries are repeated as one name and for <carrefourjogo7.com> the street address is listed in Brazil but the city name appears to be entirely different.

Considering all the above, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are likely to be under common control, as there is sufficient connection between all the disputed domain names in terms of their registration dates, Registrar, TLD, naming pattern, composition and use.

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 it owns registered trade mark rights for its CARREFOUR mark as set out above. It submits that each of the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's earlier well known trade mark, together with generic terms related to gambling or to the Internet. It notes in this regard that "jogo" means "game" in Portuguese. It says that in circumstances that the Complainant offers banking services in Europe and Brazil that the combination of its trade mark used for banking and payment services together with terms associated with gambling are only likely to increase the risk of confusion. In any event it submits that the addition of these generic terms does not reduce a likelihood of confusion. Accordingly, says the Complainant, each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to its earlier well-known trade mark.

The Complainant submits that, based upon its searches, it has found no evidence whatsoever that the Respondents own any trade mark registrations including the CARREFOUR mark, or that they are commonly known by any of the disputed domain names, whether as an individual, business, or other organisation. Secondly, it says that the Respondents have reproduced the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark in the disputed domain names without any license or authorisation from the Complainant, which it submits is strong evidence of the lack of legitimate interest. Thirdly, the Complainant asserts that 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.

The Complainant notes that at the time of filing, the disputed domain name <carrefourbetapp.com> resolved to a website for on-line gambling targeted at the Brazilian market. Although the disputed domain name <carrefourjogo7.com> currently resolves to an error page, the Complainant has submitted a historical screenshot from July 28, 2025, which displays a logo with the words "Carrefour Jogo" and images of dice and poker chips. It asserts that the translation of "gambling" into Portuguese is "jogo de azar", with "jogo(s)" occasionally used as shorthand and that the choice of the disputed domain name and logo strongly suggests that <carrefourjogo7.com> was used, or intended to be used, in the same manner as <carrefourbetapp.com>.

The Complainant says that the use of the disputed domain names for these purposes cannot be deemed to be "in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services" in terms of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. It also asserts that the use of <carrefourjogo7.com> to resolve to a blank page does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services. Since its trade mark registrations pre-date by far the registration of the disputed domain names, the Complainant says that the burden is on the Respondents to establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that it has made out a prima facie case under the second element of the Policy and that none of the circumstances which set out how a respondent can prove rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names are present in this case.

As far as registration and use in bad faith are concerned, the Complainant submits that considering the degree of prior reputation attaching to the Complainant's marks, the Respondents necessarily had the Complainant's name and trade marks in mind when registering the disputed domain names. It says that the Respondents' choice to register the disputed domain names cannot have been accidental and must have been influenced by the fame of the Complainant and its earlier CARREFOUR trade mark.

It says that it is highly likely that the Respondents chose the disputed domain names because of their identity with, or similarity to, a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights and legitimate interests. This was most likely done, says the Complainant, in the hope and expectation that Internet users searching for the Complainant's services and products would instead come across the disputed domain names belonging to the Respondents. Further, says the Complainant, its trade mark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain names. A quick trade mark search would have revealed to the Respondents the existence of the Complainant and of its trade marks. A simple search in an on-line search engine would have shown only results related to the Complainant.

As far as use in bad faith is concerned, the Complainant submits that by simply maintaining the disputed domain names, the Respondents are preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trade marks in corresponding domain names. In addition, says the Complainant, the use of the disputed domain names in connection with on-line gambling is further evidence of bad faith on the part of the Respondents. It asserts that the Respondents are actively trying to benefit from the renown and fame attaching to the CARREFOUR mark for its own commercial gain by creating confusion in the mind of the average Internet user. In relation to <carrefourjogo7.com> it says that the fact that the disputed domain name resolves to an error page does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Overall, the Complainant asserts that it cannot think of any future use of the disputed domain names that may be done by the Respondents in good faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions, but the Center received an email on August 21, 2025 from one of the Respondents with the text "Parsing stopped" and on September 25, 2025, received a further email following the appointment of the Panel with the text "The domain name is not mine".

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Matters – 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 one day apart through the same registrar and the Complainant's evidence suggests that they have both been used at some time in relation to Brazilian gambling activities. The registered contact data suggests that it is more likely than not that both registrants are Brazilian and that it is most likely that the registered address details are contrived and false. In these circumstances the Panel finds it most likely that the 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

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 trade mark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant’s registered CARREFOUR mark is recognisable within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, each of the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The additional inclusion in each of the disputed domain names of common terms relating to gambling or to the Internet does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

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.

The Complainant has submitted that, based upon its searches, it has found no evidence whatsoever that the Respondent owns any trade mark registrations including the CARREFOUR mark, or that it is commonly known by any of the disputed domain names, whether as an individual, business, or other organisation. It has also asserted that the Respondent has reproduced the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark in the disputed domain names without any licence or authorisation from the Complainant, which it submits is strong evidence of the lack of legitimate interest. The Complainant has also submitted that the Respondent has 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.

The Complainant has noted that at the time of filing, the disputed domain name <carrefourbetapp.com> resolved to a website for on-line gambling targeted at the Brazilian market. Although the disputed domain name <carrefourjogo7.com> currently resolves to an error page, the Complainant has submitted a historical screenshot from July 28, 2025, which displays a logo with the words “Carrefour Jogo” and images of dice and poker chips. It has asserted that the translation of “gambling” into Portuguese is “jogo de azar”, with “jogo(s)” occasionally used as shorthand and that the choice of the disputed domain name and logo strongly

suggests that <carrefourjogo7.com> was used, or intended to be used, in the same manner as <carrefourbetapp.com>.

The Complainant has submitted that the use of the disputed domain names for these purposes cannot be deemed to be “in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services” in terms of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. It has also asserted that the use at filing of <carrefourjogo7.com> to resolve to a blank page does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant has also noted that its trade mark registrations pre-date by far the registration of the disputed domain names.

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 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 in 2025 and many years after the registration of the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark. Considering the very substantial degree of international reputation attaching to the CARREFOUR mark and retail business as the result of long and established use and the fact that a simple Internet search would have immediately identified the Complainant’s websites, it is highly likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s mark and business when it registered the disputed domain names and that it chose them because of their identity with or similarity to the Complainant’s trade mark.

While the first email received by the Center on August 21, 2025 from the Respondent made no sense at all, the second email received on September 25, 2025, after communication of the Panel’s appointment, ostensibly denied ownership but failed to explain the position further. In these circumstances the Panel finds that these communications lack credibility and do not need to be considered further.

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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy there is evidence of registration and use of the domain name in bad faith where a respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

At the date of filing of this Complaint, the disputed domain name <carrefourbetapp.com> resolved to a website for on-line gambling targeted at the Brazilian market. Although the disputed domain name <carrefourjogo7.com> currently resolves to an error page, the Complainant has submitted a historical screenshot from July 28, 2025, which displays a logo with the words “Carrefour Jogo” and images of dice and poker chips. It appears in this case that the Respondent is using, or has used, the disputed domain names containing the very well-reputed CARREFOUR mark to intentionally attract Internet users to its website by confusing them into assuming that they would be diverted to the Complainant’s website. This conduct fulfills the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) and is therefore evidence of registration and use of each of the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including an error page as in this case) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Even if the <carrefourjogo7.com> had not previously been used to divert to a gambling related page and only diverted to an error page as it does now, the Panel would have found that in the circumstances the non-use of this disputed domain name amounted to bad faith.

Previous panels have found bad faith in circumstances of the passive holding of a disputed domain name where (i) there is a high degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the respondent has failed to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent has concealed its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) it is not plausible that the disputed domain name will be used in good faith.

In this case the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark is highly distinctive and is very well reputed internationally. The Respondent failed to explain its registration of the disputed domain name <carrefourjogo7.com>. The Respondent attempted to conceal its identity by using a privacy service and based on the information provided by the Complainant it appears that his address information is most likely false. Considering the degree of renown attaching to the CARREFOUR mark, it is difficult to see any plausible justification for the registration of this disputed domain name <carrefourjogo7.com> by the Respondent and it is most likely that the Respondent did not intend to use the disputed domain name <carrefourjogo7.com> in good faith. For these reasons the Panel also finds that the disputed domain name <carrefourjogo7.com> was registered and has been used passively in bad faith and that the Complaint also succeeds under section 4(a)(iii) of 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 names <carrefourbetapp.com> and <carrefourjogo7.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/

Alistair Payne

Sole Panelist

Date: October 9, 2025