

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Carrefour SA v. lojas riach, lojasriach  
Case No. D2025-3811

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is lojas riach, lojasriach, Brazil.

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

The disputed domain name <tiendascarrefour.shop> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 18, 2025. On September 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 22, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 24, 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 24, 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 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Duy Khanh Nguyen as the sole panelist in this matter on October 23, 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 SA, a French multinational retail and wholesale company, headquartered in Massy, France. The Complainant is one of the world's leading and most recognised retailers. It operates through hypermarkets, supermarkets, and convenience stores and also offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services. In 2023, the Complainant recorded revenue of EUR 84.9 billion and is listed on the CAC 40 index of the Paris Stock Exchange. The Complainant runs more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries, employing over 500,000 people worldwide and serving millions of customers every day.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for CARREFOUR, including:

- International Trademark No. 351147 for CARREFOUR, registered on October 2, 1968, duly renewed, and designating goods in international classes 1 to 34;
- International Trademark No. 353849 for CARREFOUR, registered on February 28, 1969, duly renewed, and designating services in international classes 35 to 42;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 5178371 for CARREFOUR, registered on August 30, 2007, duly renewed, and designating goods and services in international classes 9, 35, and 38; and
- Brazilian Trademark No. 830532692 for CARREFOUR, registered on December 26, 2012, duly renewed and designating services in international class 35.

In addition, the Complainant also owns numerous domain names, including for example:

- <carrefour.com> registered since 1995;
- <carrefour.com.br> registered since 1997; and
- <carrefour.es> registered since 2000.

The disputed domain name <tiendascarrefour.shop> was registered on August 29, 2025. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active web page. According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a web page bearing the Complainant's trademark and logo, displaying a promotional photo of household appliances, and an image of a shopping cart and login icon in the top-right corner of the website.

#### **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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known CARREFOUR trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces the CARREFOUR mark in its entirety, together with the generic term "tiendas" meaning "stores" in Spanish, and the addition of the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".shop".

The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant puts forth that 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.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name are in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant claims that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's name and trademarks in mind, choosing it because of its similarity to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and legitimate interests. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's current non-use and any future use of the disputed domain name may not be considered good faith use under the doctrine of passive holding. Moreover, the disputed domain name was previously used for as an e-commerce website that displayed the Complainant's trademark and promoted the sale of household appliances, a product line offered by the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that 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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

Although the addition of the term "tiendas" (Spanish for "stores") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the additional of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8, and *Carrefour SA v. Radistan Gosh*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2025-0020](#).

Lastly, it is permissible for the Panel to disregard the applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in the disputed domain name, i.e., ".shop". [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 with 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 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 Respondent has not provided evidence of a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name or reasons to justify his or her choice of the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark. Further, there is no indication to show that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or otherwise has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In addition, the Complainant has not granted the Respondent a license or authorisation to use the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark or register the disputed domain name.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page. Based on the undisputed submission and evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website bearing the logo and trademark of the Complainant and displaying an advertisement promoting some products. The Panel notes, that the screenshot provided by the Complainant is incomplete, and therefore it is not clear if the website offered for sale any products. However, the Panel also notes that website displayed an image of a shopping cart. Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s mark and the additional term “tiendas” (Spanish for “stores”), carries a risk of an implied affiliation with the Complainant as Internet users may misbelieve that the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

None of the circumstances in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy are present in this case.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Based on the available information, 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 name was registered almost 57 years after the first registration of the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark recorded under section 4. Search results using the key words “carrefour” on search engines direct Internet users to the Complainant and its business, which indicates that an exclusive connection between the mark and the Complainant has been established. The

Panel notes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that displayed the Complainant's mark. As such, the Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant's marks when registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Furthermore, the Panel considers the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that displayed the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark and logo and promoted some products with an image of a shopping cart and login icon. The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website for possible commercial gain. This demonstrates bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name, as provided in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, the Panel finds that the current non-use of the disputed domain name 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 that (i) the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark is well known; (ii) the Respondent has failed to submit a response or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; (iii) the Respondent has concealed its identity and appears to have provided incomplete or false contact details because the Written Notice could not be delivered by courier; and (iv) the impossibility of any future use of the disputed domain name in good faith noting the composition of the disputed domain name clearly targets the Complainant and carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Given all the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant before registering the disputed domain name, and considering the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests, and by registering and using the disputed domain name as discussed above as well as continuing to hold the disputed domain name, the Panel is led to conclude that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Based on the available records, 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 <tiendascarrefour.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Duy Khanh Nguyen/*

**Duy Khanh Nguyen**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025