

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. julio query, kio gusan
Case No. D2025-4276

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are julio query, Spain and kio gusan, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <carrefourpassalert.info> and <carrefourpass-home.info> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “First Registrar”). The disputed domain name <carrefourpasscuenta.info> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Second Registrar”).

(the First Registrar and the Second Registrar are referred to collectively as the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 17, 2025. On October 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 21, 2025, and October 23, 2025, the Registrars 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 (“Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot”) and contact information of the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 23, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint 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 23, 2025, alleging that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or the disputed domain names are under common control. Accordingly, the Respondents or registrants are referred to as “the Respondent”.

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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin as the sole panelist in this matter on December 3, 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 following summary sets out the uncontested factual submission made by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant pioneered the concept of hypermarkets in 1968 and is today a global leader in this retail segment. The Complainant is also listed on the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40).

4.2 With a revenue of EUR 84.9 billion in 2023, the Complainant operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries and employs more than 500,000 employees worldwide. It receives millions of daily unique visitors in its stores. Apart from the usual retail offering, the Complainant also provides travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services including Carrefour Pass which is a credit card offered by the Complainant, with a connected mobile application and online platform.

4.3 The Complainant has applied for and registered numerous trademarks globally in respect of the word "CARREFOUR" and "CARREFOUR PASS" (the "Trademarks") including variations thereof. The following table includes a sample of registrations of the Trademarks by the Complainant (whether on its own or through its related or associated company) in selected jurisdictions:

Jurisdiction	Mark	Registration Number	Date of Registration	Classification of Goods / Services
International	CARREFOUR	351147	October 2, 1968	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 1,4 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 4, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
International	CARREFOUR	353849	February 28, 1969	35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42
European Union	CARREFOUR	5178371	August 30, 2007	9, 35, 38
International	CARREFOUR PASS	719166	August 18, 1999	36

4.4 The Complainant has a strong Internet and social media presence. The Complainant's Facebook page alone has more than 12 million followers. The Complainant uses and advertises the Trademarks extensively through this medium. The Complainant has also registered numerous domain names comprising the Trademarks, both under generic and country-code Top Level Domains. For instance, <carrefour.com> has been registered since 1995, <carrefourpass.com> since 2010, and <carrefour.es> since 2018.

4.5 The disputed domain names were registered on September 29, 2025 and October 1, 2025. The registration, use and adoption of the Trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain names.

4.6 At the time of filing the Complaint, the identities of the registrant of the disputed domain names were not made available to the public. The registrants were listed as “Super Privacy Limited Ltd” and “Unknown,” which are entities typically used to provide proxy services to conceal the identities of registrants.

4.7 The Complainant has not licensed or authorised the Respondent to use or to register the Trademarks, whether for the disputed domain names or otherwise.

4.8 The disputed domain names resolve to error pages which state that the webpage cannot be found or that the server is redirecting the request for the address in a way that will never complete.

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, inter alia, as follows:

5.1 The Complainant asserts that the Trademarks are distinctive, well-known, and used globally and that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Trademarks for the following reasons:

(a) the Complainant had initiated several WIPO administered ICANN UDRP proceedings related to the Trademarks where the panellists in those proceedings essentially found that the Complainant's Trademarks were globally well-known and distinctive trademarks (see *Carrefour SA v. jean noel ballart*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2225](#); *Carrefour SA v. Sui Yuan, Bao Bao Liu*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3003](#); *Carrefour v. Andre Machado*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2020-0004](#); *Carrefour SA, Atacadão - Distribuição, and Comércio E Indústria LTDA. v. Charles E Petty, capsulecopr, Himan Washington, hunterfast, Ridick Iastri, camilz, julio tena, fastG, GRIGORUTA BENIAMIN, Not Applicable, Clyde M Jacobs, Not Applicable, No Name, No Name*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0966](#)).

(b) the Trademarks are the most distinctive elements in the disputed domain names and the addition of the words “home”, “alert” and “cuenta” do not change that fact and would instead cause Internet users to be confused as to whether an association, affiliation or endorsement exists between the disputed domain names and the Complainant.

5.2 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain names because:

(a) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor was it validly known as such prior to the dates on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain names. The Complainant's trademark searches also did not reveal any trademark registrations by the Respondent or the entities which provided the privacy services to the Respondent.

(b) the Respondent has not been licensed or authorised to use any of the Trademarks, whether for the disputed domain names or in any other form howsoever.

(c) the Respondent had not made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and that all the disputed domain names resolve to error pages.

(d) the burden is on the Respondent to establish the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names since the adoption and extensive use of the Trademarks by the Complainant predates by far the registration of the disputed domain names.

5.3 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain names in bad faith and relies on the following:

- (a) the Respondent knew that the Trademarks were owned or registered by the Complainant at the point when the Respondent registered the disputed domain names. Given the Complainant's global reputation and the well-known status of the Trademarks, the decision to register the disputed domain names could not have been accidental.
- (b) the Respondent intended to use the disputed domain names to mislead Internet users who are searching for the Complainant's services or products to the Respondent's websites instead by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the websites.
- (c) the Trademarks were registered long before the registration of the disputed domain names and hence, the Respondent knew or should have known of the existence of the Trademarks.
- (d) the disputed domain names resolve to error pages and, therefore, appear to be passively held by the Respondent.
- (e) the Respondent's efforts to conceal its identity using a Whois proxy service as well as the use of questionable contact details can be construed as further evidence that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.
- (f) the Respondent has a history of registering the Trademarks and displays a similar pattern of bad faith conduct involving the Trademarks (see *Carrefour SA. v. kio gusan, gofast2, Lisa Donofrio, kio gusanagu*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3329](#), involving the domain names <app-carrefourpass.info>, <carrefourpasslogin.info>, <carrefourpassnet.info>, <carrefourpassnet.info>, <webcarrefourpass.click>, <web-carrefourpass.info>, <webscarrefourpass.click>, <webscarrefourpass.com>).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of 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 the following evidence relied upon by the Complainant:

- (a) the disputed domain names were registered within a period of just three days.
- (b) the disputed domain names began with the phrase “carrefourpass,” followed by a single generic word.
- (c) the disputed domain names were registered under the same generic Top Level Domain, namely “.info”.
- (d) the registration data of the disputed domain names contain expressions in Spanish. The first set of contact data for <carrefourpassalert.info> and <carrefourpass-home.info> points to a likely nominal registrant in Madrid, Spain and the street address is expressed in Spanish: “calle6 y bolivar.” The second set of contact data for <carrefourpasscuenta.info> points to a likely nominal registrant in the United States, with an address spelt out in Spanish: “Pennsylvania y la oficina de correos James A. Farley”
- (e) both sets of registration data present illogical values, suggesting they were fabricated by the user. For example, the street address “Pennsylvania y la oficina de correos James A. Farley” appears to correspond to the historic James A. Farley Building in New York City, which was previously the Pennsylvania Terminal. Authentic tenant addresses at this property omit the historical reference to Pennsylvania Terminal and contain fully formed street names and numbers. The Street address “calle 6 y bolivar” from Set 1 would appear to reference an intersection of Calle 6 and Calle del Bolivar, an intersection that, according to the Complainant’s research, does not exist in Madrid.

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 in a single proceeding (henceforth referred to as “Respondent”).

6.2 Substantive Issues

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant is required to establish the following elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (a) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (b) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (c) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 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 is satisfied with the evidence adduced by the Complainant of various international registrations of the Trademarks as well as the continued uninterrupted use of the Trademarks over the course of more than half a century on a global basis to build the reputation and goodwill of the Trademark.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Although the addition of other characters here, “home”, “alert” and “cuenta”, and the use of the gTLD “.info” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that neither the addition of such terms nor the use of the gTLD prevents a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.8 and 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 Complainant has clearly stated that it has not authorized the Respondent in any way to use the Trademarks or to register the disputed domain names. The Complainant has also denied any affiliation or association with the Respondent.

Also noting the findings under the third prong of the Policy, 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 Panel is cognizant of the goodwill attached to the Trademark. This often leads to attempts to hijack or to ride and usurp the goodwill attached thereto by third parties unconnected to the Complainant. The evidence adduced by the Complainant suggests that the Respondent intended to do so. This includes the following factors:

(a) the date of registration of the disputed domain names which were more than half a century after the Trademarks were registered and acquired distinctiveness and global appeal;

- (b) the inclusion of the Trademarks in their entirety in the disputed domain names;
- (c) the manner in which the Respondent uses the disputed domain names that direct to error pages, suggesting passive holding on its part;
- (d) the pattern of conduct of registering and using the Complainant's Trademarks by the Respondent;
- (e) the notoriety, fame and repute attached to the Trademarks which several UDRP panelists have concluded are well-known.

Having reviewed the record, therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a 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 the reputation of the Complainant's Trademarks, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use. The Panel 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.

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 <carrefourpassalert.info>, <carrefourpasscuenta.info> and <carrefourpass-home.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin/

Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin

Sole Panelist

Date: December 15, 2025