

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Lisa Donofrio , Julio Querty
Case No. D2025-3988

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Lisa Donofrio, United States of America and Julio Querty, Spain.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carrefourpasshelp.info>, <carrefourpassonline.info>, and <passcarrefourweb.info> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 30, 2025. On September 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 6, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 6, 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 October 6, 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 October 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 29, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on November 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on November 19, 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 worldwide leader in retail and hypermarkets starting in 1968. With a revenue of 76 billion Euros in 2018, the Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40). The Complainant operates more than 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide and additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, or ticketing services. The Complainant has more than 384,000 employees worldwide and 1.3 million daily visitors in its stores. The Complainant's Facebook page is currently "liked" by more than 11 million Internet users.

The Complainant has almost 6.2 million users "liking" its TikTok account and more than 740k followers on its Instagram account.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks for CARREFOUR worldwide including:

- United States of America trademark registration No. 6763415, CARREFOUR (word), filed on December 8, 2020 and registered on June 21, 2022, for services in international class 35;
- International trademark registration No. 351147, CARREFOUR (word), registered on October 2, 1968, for goods and services in international classes 1 to 34; and
- International trademark registration No. 353849, CARREFOUR (word), registered on February 28, 1969, for services in international classes 35 to 42.

The CARREFOUR brand enjoys wide reputation, as repeatedly recognised (*Carrefour SA v. Jean Noel Ballart*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2225](#); *Carrefour v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Milen Radumilo*, *Carrefour SA v. Youssefgcxh Elachourix*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0840](#)).

The Complainant is also the owner of domain names including the word CARREFOUR, such as <carrefour.com> registered since 1995, <carrefour.fr> registered since 2005, <carrefourpass.com> registered since 2010, and <carrefourpass.net> registered since 2013.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows: <carrefourpassonline.info> on September 8, 2025, and <carrefourpasshelp.info> and <passcarrefourweb.info> on September 12, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names <carrefourpassonline.info> and <passcarrefourweb.info> resolved, per the Complainant, to a default Registrar or website hosting provider landing page, displaying the message "this site is currently under construction". After the filing of the Complaint, they lead to an error page and an "under construction" page respectively.

The third disputed domain name <carrefourpasshelp.info> resolved, per the Complainant, at the time of filing of the Complaint, to a fake login page related to the management of the Carrefour Pass credit card.

Currently all three disputed domain names <carrefourpassonline.info>, <carrefourpasshelp.info> and <passcarrefourweb.info> lead to the same error page which reads "Connection timed out Error code 522".

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which the Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain names:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants, as regards to one of the three disputed domain names, the other two are filed by the same registrant. The Complainant alleges that all 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:

- all three disputed domain names have been registered within a short period of time, namely September 8 and September 12, 2025;
- all three disputed domain names have the same Registrar, Dynadot Inc.;
- all three disputed domain names follow the same pattern of "CARREFOURPASS" + term "online" or "web" or "help", namely generic terms that are directly related to the business field of the Complainant which provides online services among others;
- all three disputed domain names have the same Top-Level Domain;
- all three disputed domain names are hosted on the same name servers (cory.ns.cloudflare.com and maya.ns.cloudflare.com); and
- the named registrants use the same mailing service provider (gmail) for all three disputed domain names email contact.

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.

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 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 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

Although the addition of other terms here, “pass”, “online”, “help”, and “web”, 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLDs”) “.info” is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

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 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 Respondent has not submitted any response and has not claimed any such rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain names. As per the Complainant, the Respondent was not authorized to register the disputed domain names.

The Respondent, prior to the notice of the dispute, did not demonstrate any use of the disputed domain names or a trademark corresponding to the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the contrary, as the Complainant claimed, the disputed domain names resolved to “under construction” pages and a fake login page related to the management of the Carrefour Pass credit card. The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon the Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

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’s CARREFOUR trademark is well known (see for example *Carrefour v. rabie nolife*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0673](#); *Carrefour v. Jane Casares, NA*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0976](#); *Carrefour v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Robert Jurek, Katrin Kafut, Purchasing clerk, Starship Tapes & Records*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-2533](#); *Carrefour v. Tony Mancini, USDIET Whoisguard, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0962](#)). Because the CARREFOUR mark had been widely used and registered by the Complainant at the time of the disputed domain names registration and enjoyed reputation, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant’s trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain names (*Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#)). Furthermore, the Complainant’s entire trademark is included in the disputed domain names. Last, per the Complainant, the third disputed domain name <carrefourpasshelp.info> resolved at the time of filing of the Complaint, to a fake login page related to the management of the Carrefour Pass credit card. The above is a clear indication that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademarks and chose the disputed domain names having the Complainant in mind.

In this case, two of the disputed domain names <carrefourpassonline.info> and <passcarrefourweb.info> displayed a text stating “under construction”, which previous panels have considered equivalent to a passive holding, the Panel notes that 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith use in the circumstances of this proceeding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

In the present case, the Panel notes a) the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, b) the fact that the Respondent has not submitted a response, and c) the composition of the disputed domain names, which incorporate the Complainant’s trademark entirely, 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.

As regards the third disputed domain name <carrefourpasshelp.info> which resolved, per the Complainant, at the time of filing of the Complaint, to a fake login page related to the management of the Carrefour Pass credit card, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 names <carrefourpasshelp.info>, <carrefourpassonline.info>, <passcarrefourweb.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: December 3, 2025