

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Yusuf islam karatas, Yusuf islam karatas, and Zayn Sofuoglu
Case No. D2025-3862

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Yusuf islam karatas, Yusuf islam karatas, and Zain Sofuoglu, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carrefoursa.cloud> and <marketcarrefoursa.online> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 23, 2025. On September 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 23, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 24, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. 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 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on October 27, 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 retail business based in France where it was founded for over fifty years and where it is well-known. The Complainant operates through many stores bearing the CARREFOUR name including in Türkiye as well as through its official website "www.carrefour.com". The domain name <carrefour.com> has been registered in 1995. In Türkiye, the Complainant has a partnership with Carrefour SA which operates through the website "www.carrefoursa.com". The Complainant is a listed company on the Paris Stock Exchange.

The Complainant owns several registered trademark rights for or containing its CARREFOUR name, including European Union Trademark Registration No. 5178371 for the mark CARREFOUR in classes 9, 35 and 38 (registered on August 30, 2007).

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names including <carrefour.com> which is linked to its official website and has an important presence in social media, for example on Facebook.

The disputed domain name <carrefoursa.cloud> was created on August 21, 2025 and the disputed domain name <marketcarrefoursa.online> on August 26, 2025. At the time that the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names are inactive as they were resolving to "error pages".

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the complaint shall be consolidated as both disputed domain names were registered in a very short time frame, share a similar naming pattern, are inactive and are registered by individuals supposedly residing in the same city in Türkiye by using fanciful contact details.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its registered trademark CARREFOUR, because the CARREFOUR trademark is identifiable within the disputed domain names. The addition of the letters "sa" in both disputed domain names heighten the risk of confusion as "sa" is an abbreviation for "Société Anonyme" and the Turkish partnership of the Complainant is Carrefour SA which is active on the Internet through the domain name <carrefousa.com>. The addition of the term "market" in the disputed domain name <marketcarrefoursa.online> misleads Internet users into believing that there is an association with the Complainant.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondents do not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, because there is no evidence that the Respondents (i) have filed applications for or registered the trademark CARREFOUR, (ii) have been commonly known by the disputed domain names or the trademark CARREFOUR, or (iii) have used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in

relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or otherwise fair activities. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondents' use and/or registration of the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark and the disputed domain names are inherently likely to mislead Internet users into believing that there is a link with the Complainant (high risk of implied affiliation). The Complainant further notes that where a domain name resolves to an error page, normally is not considered by panels to constitute bona fide use.

The Complainant further states that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith because the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is well-known; it is therefore inconceivable that the Respondents were not aware of the Complainant and its rights prior to registering the disputed domain names. The Respondents registered the disputed domain names with the expectation that Internet users would locate the disputed domain names when searching for the Complainant's activities, and there is no conceivable good faith use or purpose to which the disputed domain names could be put.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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 the disputed domain names were registered at approximately the same time with the same Registrar and both link to inactive websites. Furthermore, the Respondents have indicated when registering the disputed domain name to be both residing in the same city in Türkiye whereby the said city does not seem to exist. Finally, the disputed domain names have the same pattern of composition and both include not only the trademark CARREFOUR but also the letters "sa".

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

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the letters “sa” in each of the disputed domain name which stands for “Société Anonyme” (French word for “limited company”) and of the descriptive term “market” in <marketcarrefoursa.online> may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, but the Panel finds the addition of such letters and term do 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.

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

C. 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 Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain names which combines the Complainant’s well-known trademark CARREFOUR with the term, “market” and the letters “sa” which descriptively stand for “Société Anonyme” is suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant. The risk of affiliation is particularly high since the Complainant has established a partnership in Türkiye (where the Respondent is supposedly based) with a company operating under the name of Carrefour SA and an official website in Turkish language which can be reached under the domain name <carrefoursa.com>. 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 the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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 names were registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark particularly because the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain names by more than 50 years and is highly distinctive and well known.

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.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain names were not connected to active websites.

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 or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Previous UDRP panels have also found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith for the purpose of Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4

In the present case, the Panel also notes the silence of the Respondent in the proceedings, the use of a privacy service when registering the disputed domain names and the fact that the contact details which were provided when registering the disputed domain names are fanciful and were probably fabricated.

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 names <carrefoursa.cloud> and <marketcarrefoursa.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: November 25, 2025