

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. kio gusan, gofast2 and fastpanel, kio gusanagui
Case No. D2025-3412

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are kio gusan, gofast2, United States of America ("United States"), and fastpanel, kio gusanagui, Spain.

2. The Disputed Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carrefourpass-app.info>, <carrefourpass-apps.info>, and <carrefourpassweb.info> are registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com. The disputed domain names <carrefourpass-web.info>, <carrefourpass-webs.info>, and <carrefourpasswebs.info> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (collectively, the "Registrars"). The Panel will hereinafter refer to the disputed domain names collectively as the "Disputed Domain Names".

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 Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On August 27, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, 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 September 1, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, 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 September 8, 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 2, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on October 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on October 20, 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 one of the worldwide leaders in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1968. The Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40) and had revenues of EUR 76 billion in 2018. The Complainant operates more than 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide, has more than 384,000 employees and more than a million of daily unique visitors in its stores. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide for or including CARREFOUR, such as the following:

- the International Trademark Registration number 351147 for CARREFOUR (word), registered on October 2, 1968, covering goods in International Classes from 1 to 34;
- the International Trademark Registration number 719166 for CARREFOUR PASS (word), registered on August 18, 1999, covering services in International Class 36;
- the European Union Trademark Registration number 008779498 for CARREFOUR (word), filed on December 23, 2009, registered on July 13, 2010, covering services in International Class 35; and
- the United States Trademark Registration number 6763415 for CARREFOUR (word), filed on December 8, 2020, registered on June 21, 2022, covering services in International Class 35.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names incorporating CARREFOUR, such as <carrefour.com> registered on October 25, 1995, and <carrefour.fr> registered on June 23, 2005. The Complainant uses its domain names in order to develop its brand and promote its products and services.

Numerous UDPR panels have acknowledged the Complainant's trademark reputation. See *Carrefour SA v. packet emblazer*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4675](#) and cases cited therein.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered as follows:

- <carrefourpasswebs.info> and <carrefourpassweb.info>, were registered on July 18, 2025;
- <carrefourpass-web.info>, was registered on July 23, 2025;
- <carrefourpass-webs.info>, was registered on July 26, 2025;
- <carrefourpass-apps.info>, was registered on July 16, 2025; and
- <carrefourpass-app.info>, was registered on July 15, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Names were not actively used, they all resolved to error pages.

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 its earlier trademarks enjoy a wide-spread continuous reputation; the Disputed Domain Names are highly similar to the earlier trademarks CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS, since they entirely and exactly reproduce the trademarks, with additional generic terms ("web", "webs", "-app", and "-apps"), and such compositions should be regarded as confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; moreover, the words ("web", "webs", "app", "apps"), being directly linked to the Complainant's commercial activity and associated with the Complainant's trademarks, increase the risk of confusion in the mind of the average Internet user; the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names; the Respondents registered and are using the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith mainly because: the Complainant and its trademarks are widely well-known for many years and it is very likely that the Respondents knew the trademark CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Names and there can be no doubt that the Respondents have registered the Disputed Domain Names with the Complainant's name and trademarks in mind; it is nearly impossible, regarding the composition and the complexity of the Disputed Domain Names (16 to 18 to symbols), that the similarity with the Complainant's trademark is a mere coincidence; by reproducing the Complainant's trademark in the Disputed Domain Names, the Respondents strengthen the impression that they are affiliated with the Complainant; the current use of the Disputed Domain Names may not be considered a good faith use since, by simply maintaining the Disputed Domain Names, the Respondents are preventing the Complainant from reflecting its name and trademarks in the corresponding domain names; the fact that the websites under the Disputed Domain Names have been, and are still inactive, strengthens the assumption that the Respondents registered and are using the Disputed Domain Names in order to disturb the Complainant's activities or to resell them; the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding; and due to the long-lasting international reputation of the Complainant and its trademarks, the Complainant 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 reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6.1 Preliminary Procedural Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different Disputed Domain Name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the Disputed 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 disputes 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: (i) were created in a similar manner, incorporating the Complainant's trademark CARREFOUR PASS together with generic terms ("web", "webs", "app", "apps" with or without a hyphen); (ii) are registered in the same Top-Level Domain, ".info"; (iii) were registered within a short timeframe of 11 days; (iv) are not associated with active websites; (v) all registrant information share similar naming pattern, and common elements, namely "kio gusan" and "fast"; and (vi) the Respondents have not objected to the consolidation claims made by the Complainant despite the communications sent by the Center to them.

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 Issues: Three Elements

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are 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 the Disputed Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 marks CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS are recognizable within the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, each of the Disputed Domain Names is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here "web", "webs", "app", "apps", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names and the marks 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 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 notes the composition of the Disputed Domain Names which combines the Complainant's well-known trademark CARREFOUR with the term, "pass" (also reproducing the Complainant's mark CARREFOUR PASS) and the non-distinctive terms, "web", "webs", "app", "apps", with or without a hyphen, suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant. UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [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 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 Disputed Domain Names were registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark particularly because the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Names by more than 50 years and is highly distinctive and well known worldwide.

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.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Names were not connected to active websites.

UDRP 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. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and international reputation of the Complainant's trademark; the composition of the Disputed Domain Names (i.e., the combination of the Complainant's trademark CARREFOUR PASS and non-distinctive terms); the Respondent's failure to respond to the present proceedings, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy provides another circumstance of bad faith registration and use when the respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct. UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration. The Respondent's registration of at least six domain names incorporating the Complainant's mark, enforces such finding. Furthermore, at least one of the Registrar-confirmed registrants was a respondent in a previous UDRP proceeding involving the Complainant, see *Carrefour SA. v. kio gusan, gofast2, Lisa Donofrio, kio gusanagui*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3329](#). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

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, <carrefourpass-app.info>, <carrefourpass-apps.info>, <carrefourpass-web.info>, <carrefourpass-webs.info>, <carrefourpasswebs.info>, and <carrefourpassweb.info>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: November 2, 2025