

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Carrefour SA v. Wallace Andrade de paula, tienda-madrilena  
Case No. D2025-3326

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Wallace Andrade de paula, tienda-madrilena, Brazil.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <carrefour-store.shop> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 19, 2025. On August 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175696713) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 22, 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 August 25, 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 Respondent 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 Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Yuzo Wada as the sole panelist in this matter on September 19, 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 since 1968. With a revenue of 76 billion euros in 2018, the Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange. 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 a major and well-known worldwide leader in retail.

The Complainant is the holder of a number of trademarks for CARREFOUR, including the following:

- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, duly renewed, and designating goods in international classes of 1 to 34;
- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, duly renewed and designating services in international classes 35 to 42.

The Complainant holds numerous domain names containing CARREFOUR trademarks, one of which is the domain name <carrefour.com> registered in 1995.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 22, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name did not resolve to an active website. At the time of this decision, the Disputed Domain Name is not active, and it 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 Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent lacks any rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain a decision that a domain name should be either cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is 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 a 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 its CARREFOUR trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in the mark CARREFOUR. The Panel further finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to this mark, since the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's famous trademarks. The mere addition of the generic term "-store" along with the generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" to the Disputed Domain Name 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

Under the second element of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent may establish a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name by demonstrating any of the following non-exhaustive circumstances listed in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy:

- (a) that they have made preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to any notice of the dispute; or
- (b) that they are commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if they have not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (c) that they are making a legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant's trademark registrations for CARREFOUR predate the Respondent's registrations of the Disputed Domain Name <carrefour-store.shop> which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise consented to the Respondent's use of the trademarks in connection with the Disputed Domain Name.

Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not submitted any evidence in this case to demonstrate that the Respondent is the owner of any trademark rights similar to the Disputed Domain Name or that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

By not submitting a response, the Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstances which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's submissions, and the Panel concludes that the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Complainant's trademark registrations for CARREFOUR significantly predate the Respondent's registrations of the Disputed Domain Name <carrefour-store.shop> which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the Complainant's trademark CARREFOUR is widely-known. The incorporation of a widely-known trademark into a domain name by a registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith (*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#); *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#)).

The Panel finds that Internet users are likely to be misled by the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademarks into supposing that the Disputed Domain Name indicates a site belonging to, or authorized by, the Complainant. The only rational reason for using such domain name would be to attract some of the Complainant's customers to the Respondent's site. This falls squarely within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy (*Inter Ikea Systems B.V. v. Daniel Woodson*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1933](#)).

Performing searches on an online search engine for the terms "carrefour" returns multiple links referencing the Complainant and its business. Given the Complainant's worldwide reputation and presence on the Internet, the Respondent was or should have been aware of the mark CARREFOUR prior to registering the Disputed Domain Name (see *Caesar World, Inc. v. Forum LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0517](#)).

Respondent is currently holding the Disputed Domain Name passively, as the Disputed Domain Name currently resolves to an error page. From the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name, including the domain name resolving to an error page, would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3; see also *Virgin Enterprises Limited v. Cesar Alvarez*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2140](#). While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (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 or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put.

The passive holding doctrine applies in this case because the Complainant's mark is highly distinctive, Respondent failed to come forward with any evidence of a conceivable good faith use for the Disputed Domain Name, and it is implausible that Respondent can put the Disputed Domain Name to any conceivable good faith use without infringing upon Complainant's rights in its CARREFOUR mark. The Panel finds it more likely that Respondent selected the Disputed Domain Name with the intention of taking advantage of

Complainant's reputation by registering a domain name containing Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark in their entirety with the intent to ultimately use the Disputed Domain Name for an illegitimate purpose, such as misleading Internet users for Respondent's commercial gain.

Noting that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates a trademark, that no response has been filed, and that there appears to be no conceivable good faith use that could be made by the Respondent of the Disputed Domain Name, and considering all the facts and evidence, the Panel therefore finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy are also fulfilled in this case.

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 <carrefour-store.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Yuzo Wada/*

**Yuzo Wada**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 1, 2025