

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. dr Amirinia
Case No. D2025-3577

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is dr Amirinia, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefourinvest.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 3, 2025. On September 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 4, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 9, 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 9, 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Christian Gassauer-Fleissner as the sole panelist in this matter on October 8, 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, a French multinational retail and wholesaling corporation headquartered in Massy, France. It operates a chain of hypermarkets, grocery stores and convenience stores.

With a revenue of 84,9 billion euros in 2023, the Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40). The Complainant operates more than 14.000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide. With more than 500.000 employees worldwide and millions of daily unique visitors in its stores, the Complainant is a well-known worldwide leader in retail. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services.

The Complainant owns several hundred trademark rights worldwide in the CARREFOUR term ("CARREFOUR Trademark"). In particular, the Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks registered well before the registration of the disputed domain name:

- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, duly renewed, and designating goods in international classes 1 to 34;
- International trademark 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 August 30, 2007, duly renewed, and designating goods and services in international classes 9, 35 and 38; and
- United Arab Emirates trademark CARREFOUR No. 030547, registered on January 20, 2002, and designating services in international class 9;

In addition, the Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names identical to, or comprising, the CARREFOUR Trademark. For instance, <carrefour.com> has been registered since 1995 and <carrefour-invest.com> since 2022. The Complainant also operates an employee share ownership plan under the exact name "Carrefour Invest," with an official website dedicated to the plan accessible at <carrefour-invest.com>.

The disputed domain name <carrefourinvest.com> was registered on August 4, 2025. The Complainant has provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name resolved a single page with the message: "We're under construction. Please check back for an update soon." This is also true at the time of the decision, the aforesaid message being the only content of the page.

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.

On the first element of the Policy, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier well-known trademarks. The disputed domain name reproduces the earlier trademarks of the Complainant in CARREFOUR in their entirety, together with term "invest." The addition of a term to a well-known trademark in a domain name does nothing to diminish the likelihood of confusion arising from

that domain name. Even if the word “invest” were to be taken into consideration by the Panel when assessing the likelihood of confusion, this term only reinforces that risk. The Complainant is a publicly traded company, with ample resources available online for potential investors. Furthermore, the Complainant operates an employee share ownership plan under the exact name “Carrefour Invest,” with an official website dedicated to the plan accessible at “www.carrefour-invest.com”. Whether by association with investment opportunities or the share ownership plan, Internet users of average attention will likely believe that the disputed domain name is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant. The use of lower-case letter format on the one hand, and the addition of the top-level domain “.com” on the other hand, are not significant in determining whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the international trademarks of the Complainant. The Complainant therefore contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s earlier trademarks.

On the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant could not find any CARREFOUR trademark owned by the Respondent. From this finding, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has acquired no trademark in the name CARREFOUR which could have granted the Respondent rights in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization. The Respondent reproduces the Complainant’s earlier registered CARREFOUR Trademark in the disputed domain name without any license or authorization from the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorized the use of the term “carrefour” or terms similar thereto in the disputed domain name in any manner or form. The Respondent has not, before the original filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name resolves to a page with the text “We’re under construction. Please check back for an update soon” at the time of filing. The non-use of a domain, including blank or “coming-soon” pages, is not a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy. Furthermore, mail exchange records (MX records) have been set on the disputed domain name, which allow for the sending and reception of emails. The creation of an “@carrefourinvest.com” email address by a person or entity unaffiliated with the Complainant is conducive to fraudulent activity and does not create rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Since the adoption and extensive use of its trademarks by the Complainant predates by far the registration of the disputed domain name, the burden is on the Respondent to establish the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests the Respondent may have or have had in the disputed domain name. None of the circumstances which set out how a respondent can prove rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, are present in this case. The Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

On the third element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant and its trademarks were so widely well known that it is inconceivable that the Respondent ignored the Complainant or its earlier rights. The Respondent is ostensibly a resident of Dubai, a city in which the Complainant operates 66 stores and has widespread brand awareness. The Complainant cites prior WIPO case law to show that panels have recognized that the Complainant enjoys a long-lasting worldwide reputation beyond the United Arab Emirates. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent necessarily had the Complainant’s name and trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s choice of domain name cannot have been accidental and must have been influenced by the fame of the Complainant and its earlier trademarks. 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. It is highly likely that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name because of its identity with or similarity to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and legitimate interest. This was most likely done in the hope and expectation that Internet users searching for the Complainant’s services and products would instead come across the Respondent’s domain name. Such use cannot be considered a good faith use. The Complainant’s trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. Knowledge of the Complainant’s intellectual property rights, including trademarks, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, proves bad faith registration. A quick trademark search would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of Complainant and its trademarks. The Respondent’s

failure to do so is a contributory factor to its bad faith. A simple search on an online search engine shows results only related to the Complainant. At the very least, the Respondent knew or should have known that, when acquiring and using the domain name, they would do so in violation of the Complainant's earlier rights. The current use of the disputed domain name may not be considered good faith use. By simply maintaining the disputed domain name, the Respondent is preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in the corresponding domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a page with the text "We're under construction." The non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Moreover, the disputed domain name appears to be linked to an email service. Whether these emails are sent to potential investors in the Complainant's stock, or used more generally for phishing purposes, it is unequivocal that use of this domain name for email will create confusion in the mind of the email recipient and risk for trademark holder and its reputation. The Whois information of the disputed domain name appears to be incorrect. After first noting the title "dr" being used as a first name, and the sequential numbers 123234 given as Postal Code, the Street Address corresponds to the famous Burj Khalifa skyscraper, with no office or room number provided. The Complainant submits that the Respondent filled in that information as Whois data to try and escape the present proceeding. The Respondent's efforts to conceal its identity through the use of a Whois Proxy service as well as of the use of fanciful contact details can be construed as further evidence that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. The Complainant cannot think of any future use of the disputed domain name that may be done by the Respondent in good faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires that the Panel's decision be made "on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

It has been a consensus view in previous UDRP decisions that a respondent's default (i.e., failure to submit a response) would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true (see section 4.3 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)")).

The Complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the Complaint, namely that:

- (i) the disputed 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 interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered 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. [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.

The disputed domain name contains the CARREFOUR Trademark in its entirety, with the only addition of the term “invest”. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms here, “invest” 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.

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 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.

UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), 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 on record that there are no indications that the Respondent would own any CARREFOUR trademark or other right which could have granted the Respondent rights in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the CARREFOUR Trademark.

Further, the disputed domain name is not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent has not, before the original filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the disputed domain name resolves to a page with the text “We’re under construction. Please check back for an update soon” at the time of filing, as well as at the time of the decision. The non-use of a domain, including blank or “coming-soon” pages, is not a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy. Furthermore, evidence on the record shows that mail exchange records (MX records) have been set on the disputed domain name, which allow for the sending and reception of emails. The Panel finds that the creation of an “@carrefourinvest.com” email address by a person or entity unaffiliated with the Complainant is conducive to fraudulent activity and does not create rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Since the adoption and extensive use of its trademarks by the Complainant predates by far the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent should have established rights or legitimate interests it may have or have had in the disputed domain name. None of the circumstances which set out how a respondent can prove rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name are present in this case.

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.

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.

In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the CARREFOUR Trademark in its entirety together with descriptive term "invest." The CARREFOUR Trademark was registered decades before the registration of the disputed domain name. Internet users may think the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant and would resolve to a website related to the Complainant because the disputed domain name combines the CARREFOUR Trademark with the additional term "invest". The Complainant also operates an employee share ownership plan under the exact name "Carrefour Invest," with an official website dedicated to the plan accessible at <carrefour-invest.com>.

The Complainant and its trademarks were so widely well known that it is inconceivable that the Respondent ignored the Complainant or its earlier rights. Panels in prior cases involving the CARREFOUR Trademark have recognized the Complainant's worldwide reputation, see e.g. *Carrefour SA v. hanib bas*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1798](#); *Carrefour SA. v. isco diaz*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2639](#); *Carrefour SA. v. Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Ben Luis*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2910](#); *Carrefour SA. v. Reliant-web Domain Admin / Jean Marie Grolleau / Joanne Elvert*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2389](#); *Carrefour SA v. dreux denis / denis cloud*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0276](#); *Carrefour SA v. Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0807](#); *Carrefour SA v. Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Ben Luis*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2670](#); *Carrefour SA v. blackwhite, dolly Tiwari*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0274](#).

The Respondent is supposedly a resident of Dubai, a city in which the Complainant operates 66 stores and has widespread brand awareness. The Respondent likely had the Complainant's name and trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name cannot have been accidental and was likely influenced by the fame of the Complainant and its earlier trademarks. 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. It is highly likely that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name because of its identity with or similarity to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and legitimate interest. This was most likely done in the hope and expectation that Internet users searching for the Complainant's services and products would instead come across the Respondent's domain name. Such use cannot be considered a good faith use.

The current use of the disputed domain name may not be considered good faith use. At the time of this Decision and at the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active webpage which does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a page with the text "We're under construction." Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a parking page 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.

Moreover, the disputed domain name appears to be linked to an email service. Whether these emails are sent to potential investors in the Complainant's stock, or used more generally for phishing purposes, it is unequivocal that use of this disputed domain name for email will create confusion in the mind of the email recipient and risk for trademark holder and its reputation.

Furthermore, Whois information of the disputed domain name must be incorrect. An online search shows that the sequential numbers 123234 given as Postal Code correspond to a P.O. Box number for specific locations, such as the Address Downtown Dubai hotel, and the Street Address corresponds to the famous Burj Khalifa skyscraper, which is next to the Address Downtown Dubai hotel. This is further evidence of bad faith.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel inter alia notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the CARREFOUR Trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name (CARREFOUR trademark with the sole addition of the term "invest"), the failure to submit a response as well as the fact that the Respondent evidently provided false or incomplete contact information in the Whois register for the disputed domain name, and that there is no evidence of evident preparations for the use of the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, 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.

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

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 <carrefourinvest.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christian Gassauer-Fleissner/

Christian Gassauer-Fleissner

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2025