

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Carrefour SA v. Eugen Stefanescu  
Case No. D2025-3453

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Eugen Stefanescu, Spain.

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

The disputed domain name <carrefour.space> 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 26, 2025. On August 27, 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 disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy Protect, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 1, 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 September 2, 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 September 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Emre Kerim Yardimci 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 Carrefour is a French retail group operating hypermarkets all over the world. The Complainant is also offering travel, banking, insurance, or ticketing services under its house mark CARREFOUR.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks for or incorporating CARREFOUR, including:

- International trademark for CARREFOUR No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, duly renewed, and designating goods in international classes 01 to 34;
- International trademark for CARREFOUR No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, duly renewed and designating services in international classes 35 to 42.
- EUIPO trademark CARREFOUR No. 5178371, registered on 30 August 2007, duly renewed, and designating goods and services in international classes 9, 35 and 38.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <carrefour.com> registered since 1995 and <carrefour.es> since 2000.

The disputed domain name is registered on August 4, 2025, and currently resolves to a standard landing page provided by the registrar, containing no active content related to the Respondent or its business.

#### **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 it holds prior rights in the trademark CARREFOUR and that the disputed domain name, <carrefour.space>, is identical to its well-known marks. According to the Complainant, the domain name reproduces its trademark in its entirety, without the addition or omission of any letter or word. The Complainant further argues that the use of lower-case characters and the addition of the ".space" Top-Level domain are not relevant for the purpose of assessing identity or confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating them. The Complainant further states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor has it made any bona fide use or demonstrable preparations to use it in connection with a legitimate business.

The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a standard landing page provided by the registrar, containing no active content.

The Complainant also submits that setting MX ("Mail Exchange") records for the disputed domain name does not create any rights or legitimate interests, as such technical use may serve phishing or other non legitimate

purposes. Finally, given the well-known status and long-standing use of the Complainant's trademarks, the Complainant argues that the burden of proof has shifted to the Respondent to show any legitimate right or interest — which, according to the Complainant, it has failed to do.

Finally, in addressing the question of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant argues the Complainant's trademarks are well-known worldwide, including in Spain where the Respondent resides, making it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of them.

The Respondent's registration of a domain name identical to a famous mark, without authorization, and its passive holding of the domain resolving to a registrar-provided landing page, demonstrate bad faith. The Complainant further notes that the domain name appears linked to email services, which may mislead users and create confusion regarding its association with the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that

- (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 interest in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) The domain name has been registered in bad faith 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 the disputed domain name. (see 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 disputed domain name integrates the Complainant's distinctive CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety and contains no additional elements.

As regards the generic Top-Level Domain, it is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test.

For the reasons mentioned above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The onus is on the Complainant to make out at least a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and it is then for the Respondent to rebut this case. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel accepts the Complainant's submissions that the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name, has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, has no trademark rights, and has no authorization and/or consent from the Complainant to use its trademark.

The Respondent has not filed a Response. It has no authorization or consent from the Complainant to register or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to a standard landing page provided by the registrar, and while mail exchange records appear to have been activated, such technical configuration does not constitute any rights or legitimate interests. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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

The Panel accepts the Complainant's assertions that the trademark CARREFOUR is a well-known trademark. The incorporation of a well-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](#)).

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name but has not made any active use of it. The domain name currently resolves to a standard landing page provided by the registrar and shows no indication of any bona fide commercial or noncommercial activity. The Complainant's trademark is widely known, including in the Respondent's country of residence, making it unlikely that the registration was coincidental. In line with established UDRP precedent, the passive holding of a domain name incorporating a well-known mark, without any actual or contemplated good-faith use, does not prevent a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy (*Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#)).

Considering the Respondent's failure to participate in this proceeding, the lack of any plausible legitimate use, and the configuration of MX records that could facilitate deceptive activity, the Panel finds that the totality of the circumstances supports a finding that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Therefore, in view of cumulative circumstances, the Panel finds that the requirement of registration and use in bad faith is satisfied.

### **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.space> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Emre Kerim Yardimci/

**Emre Kerim Yardimci**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 20, 2025