

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. No Name, xavier dupont
Case No. D2025-3400

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are No Name, United States of America, and xavier dupont, France.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <carrefour-webmovil.com> and <login-carrefour.com> are registered with Sav.com, LLC and the disputed domain name <support-carrefour.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 23, 2025. On August 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 25, 2025, and August 26, 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 / Super Privacy Service Ltd c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 29, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) 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 29, 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 September 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on September 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Anna Carabelli as the sole panelist in this matter on October 6, 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 has been engaged in retail activities under the mark CARREFOUR for more than 60 years. Currently it operates over 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries with an annual turnover around 80 billion Euros in 2023 and is listed on the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40).

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for CARREFOUR in many jurisdictions, including the following:

- International trademark registration no. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, in classes 1-34;
- International trademark registration no. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, in classes 35-42; and
- European Union trademark registration No. 5178371, registered on August 30, 2007, in classes 9, 35, and 38.

The Complainant also owns domain name registrations consisting of the CARREFOUR trademark, for example: <carrefour.com>, registered since 1995. The Complainant has online presence via social media platforms.

The disputed domain names were registered within a few days of each other in August 2025, i.e.: <login-carrefour.com> on August 5, <support-carrefour.com> on August 6, and <carrefour-webmovil.com> on August 13. They all resolve to error pages and the disputed domain name <login-carrefour.com> displays a "Dangerous site" warning.

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 Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is distinctive and globally recognized;
- The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, since they consist of the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark with the addition of general terms separated by a hyphen;
- The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names since: (i) the Complainant has not authorized or somehow given consent to the Respondents to register and use the disputed domain names, (ii) the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and (iii) the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;

- The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondents registered them having in mind the Complainants' CARREFOUR mark. Passive holding, which is the case here, demonstrates bad faith; and
- The fact that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names with a proxy service and provided fanciful contact details during the registration process are further evidence of the Respondents' bad faith.

Based on the above, the Complainant requests the disputed domain names be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to decide the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four illustrative circumstances, which for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances any one of which, if found by the Panel, shall be evidence of the Respondents' rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy above.

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 three disputed domain names:

- were registered within a span of just a few days (from August 5 to August 13, 2025), and two of them (<carrefour-webmovil.com> and <login-carrefour.com>) with the same Registrar;
- contain registrant information in the Whois data that appears frivolous or fake, e.g., No Name, No Street for <carrefour-webmovil.com> and <login-carrefour.com>; a seemingly plausible name but an address corresponding to a historic town square in Paris with no number for <support-carrefour.com>;
- have a similar structure featuring the CARREFOUR trademark and another word associated with website functions, separated by a hyphen;
- are inactive and resolve to error pages.

The Panel finds that the record reasonably indicates 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.

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 the disputed domain name. [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 entirety of the Complainant’s registered trademark CARREFOUR is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain names. 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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain, such as “.com”, is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of another terms, here “-webmovil”, “login-”, and “support-”, 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.

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.

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.

In addition, Respondent has not used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, all disputed domain names resolve to error pages. 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 Names. See, e.g., *Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A. v. Charles Duke / Oneandone Private Registration*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0875](#); *Carrefour SA v. Hugo Fernandez et al.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5144](#)).

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 Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark has been continuously and extensively used globally for many years and has, as a result, acquired considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide, as recognized by prior UDRP decisions. See *Carrefour v. Simon Lundgren* WIPO Case No. [DAE2014-0001](#), *Carrefour v. Tucows Domains Inc. / Torsten Littmann* WIPO Case No. [D2019-2328](#), and *Carrefour v. Tool Domains Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [DGE2018-0002](#).

In view of the well-known character of the CARREFOUR trademark, it is difficult to believe that the Respondent did not have in mind the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain names, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark with the addition of general terms related to website functions. Prior panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

As to bad faith use, the evidence submitted with the Complaint shows that the disputed domain names do not point to active websites and merely resolve to error pages.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or error page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Panels 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark as an internationally established mark, the composition of the disputed domain names as discussed above, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, the Respondent's attempt to conceal his identity at the time of registration, and finds that, in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain names 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 names <carrefour-webmovil.com>, <login-carrefour.com>, and <support-carrefour.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anna Carabelli/

Anna Carabelli

Sole Panelist

Date: October 20, 2025