

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Carrefour SA v. group no  
Case No. D2025-3408

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is group no, France.

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

The disputed domain name <b2bcarrefour.pro> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 25, 2025. On August 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 26, 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 (UNKNOWN) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 27, 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 27, 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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour 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 Carrefour SA, a leading global retailer headquartered in France, with a significant presence in more than 30 countries, operating over 12,000 stores worldwide.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for CARREFOUR, including but not limited to:

- European Union trademark CARREFOUR No. 008779498, registered on July 13, 2010.
- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 563304, registered on November 6, 1990.
- French trademark CARREFOUR No. 1565338, registered on May 25, 1990.
- United States of America trademark CARREFOUR No. 6763415, registered on June 21, 2022.

The Complainant also owns several domain names incorporating the CARREFOUR mark, such as <carrefour.com> and <carrefour.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 19, 2025, by the Respondent.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to a default parking page provided by the Registrar and has not been actively used.

#### **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 asserts that:

- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CARREFOUR trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety, with the addition of the descriptive term "b2b" (business to business), which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has made any bona fide use of it.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademarks are well-known and predate the registration of the disputed domain name by many years. The Respondent's registration of a domain name incorporating the CARREFOUR mark, without authorization and without any legitimate use, is likely intended to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation. The passive holding of the disputed domain name also supports a finding of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 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 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "b2b") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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](#), section 1.8.

The addition of a gTLD such as ".pro" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant or commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Since the disputed domain name has not been used except for a holding page there is no legitimate noncommercial fair use or bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3.

The Complainant's trademark is well known, and the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 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 has not used the disputed domain name which points to a holding page.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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 distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is well-known and predates the registration of the disputed domain name by many years. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the CARREFOUR mark, with the addition of the descriptive term "b2b", which is directly related to the Complainant's business activities.

There is no evidence of any legitimate use or intent to use the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

The Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and passive holding of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark, constitutes registration and use in 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 <b2bcarrefour.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elise Dufour/

**Elise Dufour**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 10, 2025