

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. 卢丽宇 (lu li yu)

Case No. D2025-3579

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 卢丽宇 (lu li yu), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefourapp.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 4, 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 5, 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 5, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On September 5, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On September 5, 2025, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint containing a request for English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 1, 2025.

The Center appointed C. K. Kwong as the sole panelist in this matter on October 10, 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 with a revenue of EUR 84.9 billion in 2023 and is listed on the Paris Stock Exchange. It operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide with more than 500,000 employees and millions of visitors to its stores daily. The Complainant also offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services.

The Complainant is the registered owner of trademarks consisting of or embodying the word "carrefour". These registrations include:

Jurisdiction	Registration No.	Date of registration	International Classification of goods/services
International Trademark	351147 (word CARREFOUR)	October 2, 1968	1 to 34
International Trademark	353849 (word CARREFOUR)	February 28, 1969	35 to 42
European Union	5178371 (word CARREFOUR)	August 30, 2007	9, 35 and 38

The Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names embodying the word "carrefour" (Annex 5 to the Amended Complaint) including the domain name <carrefour.com> which was created on October 25, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 16, 2025. The disputed domain name did not resolve to any active website at the time of filing of the Complaint.

Other than the particulars shown in the printout of the database searches conducted by the Complainant on the WhoIs Database (as provided in Annex 2-1 to the Amended Complaint) and the website page as shown in Annex 9-1 of the Amended Complaint), there is no evidence concerning the background, businesses or activities of the Respondent.

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.

The Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark enjoys wide-spread continuous reputation as mentioned in number of UDRP decisions. Its Facebook page is currently "liked" by more than 11 million Internet users (Annex 7-1 to the Amended Complaint).

The Complainant has a strong reputation in China where the Respondent supposedly resides. It has been recognized as one of China's most popular supermarket chains (Annex 7-2 to the Amended Complaint).

The disputed domain name has incorporated the Complainant's well-known trademark CARREFOUR in its entirety with the mere addition of a generic term "app". The Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is immediately recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not registered any CARREFOUR or "CARREFOURAPP" trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to the use of its CARREFOUR trademark in the disputed domain name or in any manner or form. The disputed domain name resolves to an error page.

The adoption and extensive use of its CARREFOUR trademark by the Complainant far predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

It is implausible to believe that the Respondent was not aware of the CARREFOUR mark when it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent must have had the Complainant's name and trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

A search for "carrefourapp" on Baidu returns top results referring to the Complainant (Annex 10-2 to the Amended Complaint). A quick trademark search would have immediately revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its trademarks. The Respondent knew or should have known that, when acquiring and using the disputed domain name, they would do so in violation of the Complainant's rights.

By maintaining the disputed domain name, the Respondent is preventing the Complainant from reflecting its name and trademarks in the corresponding domain name.

Internet users searching for the Complainant's services and products would likely be misled to a website using the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Having considered the records in the case file, the Panel is satisfied that the Center has discharged its responsibility under paragraph 2(a) of the Rules to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent of the Complaint.

6.1. Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, these reasons include:

1. The disputed domain name is comprised of non-Chinese words and Latin characters only.
2. The generic English term "app" being the short form of the English word "application" was incorporated.
3. The translation of the Complaint would unfairly burden the Complainant with additional expenses and delay the proceedings.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings despite the Center's notification to the Respondent on September 5, 2025 in Chinese and English that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese and the Respondent may submit comments.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

In rendering its decision, the Panel must adjudicate the dispute in accordance with paragraph 15(a) of the Rules which provides that, "[t]he Panel shall decide a complaint 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". Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules further provides that, "if a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provisions of, or requirement under these Rules or any requests from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate".

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 the trademark CARREFOUR for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark CARREFOUR 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 addition of the element "app" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity of the disputed domain name and the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark.

It is well-established practice to disregard the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), here ".com", when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark in issue. [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.

There is no legitimate explanation on the record as to why it was necessary for the Respondent to include the word “carrefour” or adopt the expression “carrefourapp” (with the term “app” being a short form of the English term “application”) in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has also confirmed that it has not licensed the Respondent to use its trademark CARREFOUR in any way.

Use of the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark plus “app” as a suffix in the disputed domain name signals the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

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.

The Complainant has registered its CARREFOUR trademark as detailed in section 4 above and has been using it for over 50 years before the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent in 2025.

The incorporation of the unique CARREFOUR trademark entirely as part of the disputed domain name without any explanation and the prior substantial and extensive use of the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark worldwide including China, on the balance of probabilities, lead to the conclusion that the Respondent must have been aware of the existence of the Complainant and its trademark CARREFOUR at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

Although the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website, as discussed in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3, it does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of this case.

The additional generic term “app” being short form for “application” may suggest a connection to the Complainant’s business and services offered through mobile applications. In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant’s mark and with intent to target it.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of 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 <carrefourapp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/C. K. Kwong/

C. K. Kwong

Sole Panelist

Date: October 24, 2025