

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. jumex green
Case No. D2025-3409

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is jumex green, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <gestion-carrefourpass.info> and <inicio-carrefourpass.info> are registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com
PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (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 27, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Christelle Vaval as the sole panelist in this matter on September 26, 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, Carrefour S.A., is a French company established in 1968, operating internationally across more than 30 countries. It is active in the retail sector, with a primary focus on hypermarkets. Additionally, the Complainant offers a range of services, including travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark rights in the mark “CARREFOUR” in multiple jurisdictions, including European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 008779498 (registered on July 13, 2010), United States Trade Mark Registration No. 6763415 (registered on June 21, 2022), and International Trade Mark Registration No. 563304 (registered on November 6, 1990). The Complainant also holds trademark rights in the mark “CARREFOUR PASS”, including, inter alia, Brazil Trade Mark Registration No. 821744739 (registered on August 2, 2005), International Trade Mark Registration No. 719166 (registered on August 18, 1999), and United States Trade Mark Registration No. 99780481 (registered on August 27, 1999). The Complainant’s domain names are <carrefour.com>, <carrefour.fr >, <carrefourpass.com> and <carrefourpass.net>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names <gestion-carrefourpass.info> and <inicio-carrefourpass.info> on July 9, 2025, which is well after the Complainant’s trademarks were registered. The disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites, and no evidence has been submitted indicating any use of the corresponding webpages.

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 submitted a request for consolidation of Respondents. However, noting that both disputed domain names were registered by the same Respondent and are hosted by the same name servers, there is no need for discussion on the consolidation of Respondents.

1. Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant asserts that it has invested significantly in building the notoriety and reputation of its trademarks both in the physical world and in the digital one, including on social media platforms. The disputed domain names are highly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion. The Complainant’s trademarks are clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. The term CARREFOUR PASS is reproduced in its entirety and is separated by a hyphen from the words “gestion” (meaning “management” in French) and “inicio” (meaning “start” in Spanish).

The addition of terms preceding the Complainant’s trademarks increases the likelihood of confusion in the mind of the average consumer, making it plausible that the disputed domain names would be perceived as being associated with the Complainant.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant submits that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not authorized the use of its trade marks nor granted consent for the registration of the disputed domain names. There is no affiliation or relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and no evidence suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names in any personal, business, or organizational capacity. Additionally, the Respondent has neither used nor demonstrated any preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a

bona fide offering of goods or services. The absence of any content on the disputed domain names further indicates a lack of legitimate interest or good faith use. There are no facts or circumstances that would support a finding of legitimate interest on the part of the Respondent.

3. Registered and used in bad faith

With respect to registration, the Complainant claims its longstanding international trademark rights, first established in 1968, and its well-known presence in multiple jurisdictions. The Complainant contends that the Respondent likely had knowledge of its trademarks when registering the disputed domain names on July 9, 2025. The specific structure and inclusion of French and Spanish terms, languages closely associated with the Complainant's operations, support the conclusion that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant's brand. Online search for "CARREFOUR" or "CARREFOUR PASS" leads to results related to the Complainant, making it unlikely that the similarity was coincidental. Furthermore, the Complainant suggests that the disputed domain names may have been registered with the intent to resell them or to block the Complainant from registering them.

Regarding use, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names have remained inactive, resolving only to error pages. This passive holding, in the absence of any legitimate purpose, indicates an intent either to exploit the Complainant's reputation or to interfere with its business. The use of the Complainant's trademarks within the disputed domain names also gives a misleading impression of affiliation, potentially confusing users. Given the strength of the Complainant's trade mark rights, any future use of the disputed domain names would likely constitute illegitimate exploitation.

B. Respondent

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

7. Discussion and Findings

The case record shows the Center verified the Complaint's formal compliance and formally commenced the proceeding on August 29, 2025 (with a 20-day Response deadline that fell on September 18, 2025). The Center employed all reasonably available means to contact the Respondent, pursuant to paragraph 2(a) of the UDRP Rules.

The record reflects service consistent with the Rules and WIPO Supplemental Rules. In the absence of a Response, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (Rules, paragraph 14), as the Center's default notice also notes.

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, “gestion” and “inicio”,] may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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 Complainant has provided evidence of rights in the trade marks CARREFOUR and CARREFOURPASS, which are registered in multiple jurisdictions. The disputed domain names, <gestion-carrefourpass.info> and <inicio-carrefourpass.info>, incorporate the Complainant’s trademarks in their entirety.

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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case by demonstrating that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the trademarks CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS, nor has it licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known under the disputed domain names. The Complainant has further confirmed that it holds no contractual, commercial, or legal relationship with the Respondent that would justify the latter’s use of its trade marks.

Additionally, there is no indication that the Respondent has made any bona fide offering of goods or services under the disputed domain names. Both disputed domain names resolve to inactive web pages, and the Respondent has not demonstrated any intention to use the disputed domain names in connection with a legitimate business. It has been established by previous panels that mere registration of a domain name incorporating a third party’s well-known trademark without a purpose or use is insufficient to confer rights or interests under the Policy.

UDRP panels have found that domain names consisting of a trademark plus additional terms (here “gestion” (meaning “management” in French) and “inicio” (meaning “start” in Spanish), carry a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain names, <gestion-carrefourpass.info> and <inicio-carrefourpass.info>, were registered on July 9, 2025, well after the Complainant's marks were established and widely recognized in various jurisdictions. The composition of the disputed domain names, incorporating the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety, combined with descriptive terms in French and Spanish (languages closely linked to the Complainant's operations), supports a finding that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant's trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.

While the disputed domain names do not resolve to active content, their composition suggests an intent to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain names are affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant. Such targeting, even without active use, has been recognized by panels as indicative of bad faith where the circumstances of passive holding apply.

The passive holding of a domain name can amount to bad faith use when, inter alia, the Complainant's marks are well known, there is no legitimate use of the disputed domain names, and the respondent fails to provide any explanation or evidence of good faith intentions. These factors are all present in this case. The Respondent has not come forward to rebut the Complainant's contentions, nor has it offered any plausible justification for its registration of the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3).

In sum, the timing and composition of the domain name registrations, the incorporation of the Complainant's distinctive mark, and the absence of any demonstrable good-faith use or preparation thereof, support a conclusion that the Respondent acted in 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 name <gestion-carrefourpass.info> and <inicio-carrefourpass.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christelle Vaval/

Christelle Vaval

Sole Panelist

Date: October 9, 2025