

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-4154

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Name Redacted, France¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hypermarches-carrefour.com> is registered with Combell NV (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 10, 2025. On October 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 17, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 3, 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 November 3, 2025.

On November 3, 2025, the Center informed the parties in French and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is French. On November 3, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

¹The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 November 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on December 5, 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 was founded in 1959 in France. It operates more than twelve thousand stores in more than 30 countries and has more than 384,000 employees and 1.3 million daily unique visitors in its webstores.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark CARREFOUR, registered and widely known worldwide, including:

- the International trademark CARREFOUR with registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968 for goods and services in International Classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34;
- and
- the International trademark CARREFOUR with registration No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969 for services in International Classes 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 24, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website. However, the disputed domain name was used to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant.

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 the distinctive CARREFOUR mark in which the Complainant has rights. The only difference to the CARREFOUR mark is the descriptive suffix “hypermarches” (which means “hypermarkets” in French). These descriptive terms cannot eliminate the confusing similarity to the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark.

Furthermore, the Complainant notes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not linked to the Complainant in any way whatsoever and has never been authorized by the Complainant to register domain names that are similar to its trademark. The Respondent is moreover not commonly known by or associated with the disputed domain name and does not use it for any bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. The disputed domain name was registered decades after the Complainant had established rights in the mark CARREFOUR and this mark is distinctive and well-known; hence, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights in the mark CARREFOUR when registering the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website, which is also in the concept of bad faith use under the Policy and there is no plausible possible reason for a bona fide use of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Respondent used the Complainant's Chief Operating Officer's name and a business name close to the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, which is further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is French. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding, notably on the grounds of procedural efficiency and the international nature of the dispute. The Respondent did not submit any comments on the Complainant's request.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is located in France and that the disputed domain name is composed of French terms. However, the Respondent has remained entirely silent in the proceeding and has not objected to the use of English.

The Center has sent all its communications to the Parties in both English and French.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 CARREFOUR trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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 “hypermarches”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 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, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the CARREFOUR trademark in any manner.

The disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services; rather, the disputed domain name is used for illegitimate purposes (here phishing), which cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Because of the distinctiveness and the reputation of the CARRFOUR mark, it is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s rights. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a distinctive trademark by an unaffiliated entity (as it is in the present case) can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Moreover, the term “hypermarches” (“hypermarkets”) as suffix to the CARREFOUR mark in the disputed domain name rather strengthens the impression that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name. This is reinforced by the fact that Respondent used the Complainant’s Chief Operating Officer’s name and a business name close to the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, and when using the disputed domain name for sending fraudulent emails.

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, phishing) 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 name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to present any evidence of any good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain name further supports the finding of bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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 <hypermarches-carrefour.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elise Dufour/

Elise Dufour

Sole Panelist

Date : December 23, 2025