

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Minha loja Admin, Carrefour - Las Mejores Ofertas en Supermercados
Case No. D2025-3910

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Minha loja Admin, Carrefour - Las Mejores Ofertas en Supermercados, Argentina.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefour-arg.online> is 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 25, 2025. On September 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 25, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175786915) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 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 26, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Aaron Newell 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 a retail business based in France. It has been in operation for over fifty years. Its primary website can be found at “www.carrefour.com”, which has been registered since 1995.

The Complainant asserts that it presently has over 500,000 employees and operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries, and that total combined daily footfall at its retail outlets is in the multiple millions.

The Complainant is a listed company on the Paris Stock Exchange. Its global revenue approximated EUR 84,9 billion in 2023. At the time of the Complaint, the Complainant’s Facebook page had been “liked” by more than 11 million Internet users.

The Complainant owns hundreds of 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 has succeeded in numerous UDRP Complaints before this one. Panels have consistently determined that the CARREFOUR trademark is well-known and/or widely-recognised.

The disputed domain name was created on July 31, 2025. At the time that the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an error page. There is nothing in the case file to indicate any other use of the disputed domain name, and no indication that the parties have been in direct communication.

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

- i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademark CARREFOUR, because the CARREFOUR trademark is identifiable within the disputed domain name, and because the inclusion of a hyphen and the term “arg” in the disputed domain name do not offset any likelihood of confusion but instead increase the likelihood of confusion by indicating that the disputed domain name references the Complainant’s commercial activities in Argentina;
- ii) the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, because there is no evidence that the Respondent has filed applications for or registered the trademark CARREFOUR, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or the trademark CARREFOUR, the Complainant has not authorised the Respondent’s use and/or registration of the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has 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 further notes that where a domain name resolves to an error page, this normally is not considered by panels to constitute bona fide use and that, in any event, the ultimate burden is on the Respondent to establish its rights and/or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that it has not done so;

iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is so well-known that it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant and its rights prior to registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the expectation that Internet users would locate the disputed domain name when searching for the Complainant's activities, and there is no conceivable good faith use or purpose to which the disputed domain name could be put.

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 carries the burden of proving:

- i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which it 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.

The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant.

Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules does however provide that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response 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 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 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here the word "arg" preceded by a hyphen) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this 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.

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.

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 failed to respond to the Complaint. It therefore 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant’s well-known and long-established CARREFOUR trademark. The other matter in the disputed domain name comprises the three-letter term “arg” which could be viewed as a reference to the country Argentina, where the Complainant has a commercial presence.

Taken as a whole, and as asserted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name could readily misrepresent that it is the “online” presence for the Complainant’s Carrefour business in Argentina. Indeed, this assertion is rendered more credible given that the Respondent is identified as “Minha loja Admin, Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados, Argentina”, which is both an apparent misrepresentation that the Respondent holds an administrative function at the Complainant’s business, and a borrowing of a tagline that the Complainant deploys in respect of its own activities at its domain name <carrefour.com.ar>.

While the disputed domain name does not resolve to a website and at the time of filing the Complaint, it resolved to an error page, 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.

On this basis, having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and significant international reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, as well as the composition of the disputed domain name which contains the Complainant’s trademark as its focal point, as well as the risk of misrepresentation inherent in the Respondent’s provided name, 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, and that it is implausible that there is a good faith use to which the disputed domain name is likely to be put whilst in the hands of the Respondent. The Panel again notes that the Respondent has also failed to respond to or rebut the Complainant’s assertions, or to otherwise justify its registration and use of the disputed domain name.

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 <carrefour-arg.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Aaron Newell/

Aaron Newell

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025