ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Carrefour SA v. samir bufallo, paco manelas, perpe, No Name, and Domain Admin
Case No. D2025-3768

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are samir bufallo, Spain ("First Respondent"), paco manelas, perpe, American Samoa, United States of America ("Second Respondent"), No Name, United States of America ("Third Respondent"), and Domain Admin, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom ("Fourth Respondent").

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <carrefour-appmovil.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. The disputed domain name <carrefour-inicioweb.com> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited. The disputed domain name <carrefour-usuarios.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC. The disputed domain name <movil-carrefour.com> is registered with Go Canada Domains, Inc. The registrars of the four disputed domain names are jointly referred to in this Decision as the "Registrars".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 17, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 17 and 18, 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 Respondents (Tour Me, Redacted for Privacy, and Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint.

On September 22, 2025, the Center sent an email communication to the Complainant with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, inviting 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 or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 23, 2025.

The Center verified that 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on October 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on October 31, 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 a French public limited company established in 1959. It is one of the worldwide leaders in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1968. It operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries with more than 500,000 employees, and has millions of daily unique visitors in its stores. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for CARREFOUR (the "CARREFOUR trademark"):

− the International trademark CARREFOUR with registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968 for goods in International Classes 1 to 34;

− the International trademark CARREFOUR with registration No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969 for services in International Classes 35 to 42;

− the United Kingdom trademark CARREFOUR with registration No. UK00905178371, registered on August 30, 2007 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35 and 38; and

− the United States of America trademark CARREFOUR with registration No. 6763415, registered on June 21, 2022 for services in International Class 35.

The Complainant operates its official websites at the domain names <carrefour.com>, registered on October 25, 1995 and <carrefour.es>, registered on November 14, 2000.

The details about the dates of registration of the disputed domain names, their registrars, registrants, and the websites to which they resolve are the following:

Disputed domain name	**Date of registration**	**Registrar**	**Registrant**	**Status**
<movil-carrefour.com>	August 6, 2025	Go Canada Domains, Inc.	Domain Admin, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom	resolves to a parking webpage that offers it for sale and displays pay-per-click ("PPC") links related to smartphones

<carrefour-inicioweb.com>	August 17, 2025	Nicenic International Group Co., Limited	paco manelas, perpe, American Samoa, United States of America	inactive
<carrefour-appmovil.com>	August 26, 2025	Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu	samir bufallo, Spain	inactive
<carrefour-usuarios.com>	August 28, 2025	Sav.com, LLC	No Name, United States of America	inactive

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.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its CARREFOUR trademark, because they reproduce this trademark in combination with dictionary words and phrases in Spanish, all of which are related to the Internet:

Disputed domain name	Additional word or phrase	English translation
<carrefour-appmovil.com>	app movil	mobile app
<carrefour-inicioweb.com>	inicio web	homepage
<carrefour-usuarios.com>	usuarios	users
<movil-carrefour.com>	movil	mobile

The Complainant argues that the Spanish terms appended to the CARREFOUR trademark create a false impression that they relate to specific resources that are available on the Complainant's official website at "www.carrefour.com".

According to the Complainant, the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, as they are not known by them and have not acquired any relevant trademarks. The Complainant adds that the Respondents reproduce the CARREFOUR trademark in the disputed domain names without any authorization by the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents have not used or made preparations to use the disputed domain names in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services, as three of them resolve to error pages, while the fourth disputed domain name <movil-carrefour.com> resolved to a suspicious website and was later blocked by Internet service providers. The Complainant points out that the additional terms "appmovil", "inicioweb", "usuarios" and "movil" all have inherent Internet connotations and are used to identify mobile applications, homepages, user accounts, or mobile websites. According to the Complainant, the specific composition of the disputed domain names carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, and they impersonate the Complainant or suggest sponsorship or endorsement by it.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It states that the CARREFOUR trademark is widely known and the Respondents had it in mind when registering the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that the Respondents chose the disputed

domain names for their similarity to the Complainant's trademark in the hope and expectation that Internet users searching for the Complainant's products and services would be attracted to the disputed domain names and would be confused as to the source or affiliation of the associated websites.

The Complainant points out that by simply maintaining the registration of the disputed domain names, the Respondents prevent the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in corresponding domain names. The Complainant adds that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding, and that the current use of the disputed domain name <movil-carrefour.com> in connection with a website containing potentially harmful material to Internet users cannot be regarded as a good faith use under the Policy. The Complainant also submits that the Respondents have provided false contact information when registering the disputed domain names to escape liability under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issue – Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the registrants of the disputed domain names are under common control. It requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

In support of its consolidation request, the Complainant points out that the disputed domain names follow the same format, comprised of the CARREFOUR trademark, a hyphen and a Spanish word or phrase that refers to the Internet, that all of them have been registered in the ".com" Top-Level Domain within a short three-week period and that the registrant data of the Respondents appears to be false. On this basis, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are likely to be under common control.

The registrants of the disputed domain names did not comment on the Complainant's consolidation request and did not dispute any of its supporting arguments.

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 all disputed domain names were indeed registered within a short period in August 2025, that all of them share a similar naming pattern, and that the contact details of all Respondents appear to be false or incomplete. In the absence of any denial or contrary evidence, this leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why the consolidation of the disputes in respect of the disputed domain names would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive issues

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 CARREFOUR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the CARREFOUR trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the CARREFOUR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the Spanish terms "appmovil", "inicioweb", "usuarios" and "movil") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the CARREFOUR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and have 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.

All the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the CARREFOUR trademark and combine it with Spanish terms related to Internet activities. This carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The disputed domain names appear to be under common control; the Respondents have not denied the Complainant's allegations and have not provided any plausible explanation for the registration of the disputed domain names and for their intentions how to use them. In this situation, it appears to the Panel as more likely than not that the disputed domain names have been registered targeting the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark in an attempt to confuse and attract Internet users to any potential future websites associated with the disputed domain names, or to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in corresponding domain names. Such conduct would not be legitimate and would not give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondents in the disputed domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

The Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark was registered long before the registration of the disputed domain names, and three of them do not resolve to an active website. 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. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, which create a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, the failure of the Respondents to submit a Response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain names, and the apparently false or incomplete contact details provided by them. In these circumstances, the non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel therefore finds that the Respondents have registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. Regarding the fourth disputed domain name (<movil-carrefour.com>), the Panel finds in the circumstances of this case that its use to host PPC links is also evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Accordingly, 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 <carrefour-appmovil.com>, <carrefour-inicioweb.com>, <carrefour-usuarios.com>, and <movil-carrefour.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/
Assen Alexiev
Sole Panelist
Date: November 6, 2025