

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**Carrefour SA v. segundo lasser, fastsmsflur**  
**Case No. D2025-4570**

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is segundo lasser, fastsmsflur, United States of America.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <carrefourpassweb.online> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 5, 2025. On November 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 6, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 6, 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 9, 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 November 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin as the sole panelist in this matter on December 4, 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 was founded in 1959 and pioneered the concept of hypermarkets in 1963. The Complainant is also listed on the Paris Stock Exchange and was a premium partner of the 2024 Paris Olympic Games.

4.2 The Complainant receives 1.3 million of daily unique visitors in its webstores. With current revenue in the tens of billions of Euros and an employee count of more than 384,000 worldwide, the Complainant is today a major and one of the global leaders in the retail segment. Apart from the usual retail offering, the Complainant also provides financial services using the trademarks CARREFOUR PAY and CARREFOUR PASS.

4.3 The Complainant has applied for and registered numerous trademarks globally in respect of the words 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	191353	March 9, 1956	3
International	CARREFOUR	351147	October 2, 1968	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, 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 and LinkedIn pages have more than 12 million and 1.12 million followers respectively. The Complainant uses and advertises the Trademarks extensively throughout this medium. The Complainant has also registered numerous domain names comprising the Trademarks, both under generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”) and country code Top-Level Domains. For instance, <carrefour.com> has been registered since October 25, 1995, <carrefour.net> since June 18, 2001, <carrefour.eu> since March 10, 2006 and <carrefour.fr> since June 23, 2005.

4.5 The disputed domain name was registered on October 21, 2025. The registration, use and adoption of the Trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

4.6 At the time of filing the Complaint, the identity of the registrant of the disputed domain name was not made transparent to the public. The registrant was listed as “REDACTED FOR PRIVACY” with the organization “Super Privacy LTD c/o Dynadot”, which is an entity 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 name or otherwise.

4.8 The disputed domain name is subject to the following statuses: “serverTransferProhibited” and “clientTransferProhibited”. The listed nameservers are <natasha.ns.cloudflare.com> and <nitin.ns.cloudflare.com>.

4.9 At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a page displaying the following warning message:

“Warning – Suspected Phishing. This website has been reported for potential phishing. Phishing is when a site attempts to steal sensitive information by falsely presenting as a safe source”.

4.10 Apart from the above, no other content is displayed on the webpage associated with the disputed domain name.

## **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, inter alia, as follows:

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

- (a) the Trademarks have been recognized in numerous UDRP decisions as well-known trademarks in the retail and financial services sectors;
- (b) the disputed domain name reproduces the Trademarks in their entirety;
- (c) the Trademarks are the most distinctive elements in the disputed domain name and the addition of the word “web” does 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 name and the Complainant. Additionally, the inclusion of the gTLD “.online” is technically required for domain name registration and is disregarded in the comparison under the first element.

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

- (a) the Respondent has not been licensed or authorised to use any of the Trademarks, whether for the disputed domain name or in any other form howsoever;
- (b) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any of the Trademarks;
- (c) the Respondent had not made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any legitimate noncommercial or informational website. It currently displays a phishing warning, indicating that it was likely used or configured for fraudulent activity. Even if it is inactive, the passive holding of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests, particularly where no conceivable good-faith use exists;

(d) the burden shifts to the Respondent to establish the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

(a) given the Complainant's global reputation and the well-known status of the Trademarks, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights to the Trademarks. The Respondent knew that the Trademarks were owned or registered by the Complainant at the point when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name;

(b) the intentional incorporation of the Trademarks in full into the disputed domain name followed by the term "web" was meant to create a false impression of an online portal or digital extension of the Complainant's CARREFOUR PASS financial services;

(c) the Respondent sought to conceal its identity by using a privacy protection service when registering the disputed domain name;

(d) there is no plausible scenario for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name other than to refer to the Complainant or to mislead Internet users;

(e) the remark on the Respondent's website that it has been reported for potential phishing indicates that the disputed domain name has been used, or configured for use, in a manner intended to deceive Internet users and potentially obtain sensitive personal or financial information. This conduct falls squarely within the meaning of bad faith as it involves the intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the site. The act of phishing is a paradigmatic case of bad faith use.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

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 name is 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 interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(c) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 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 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 Trademarks.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other character here, “web”, and the use of the gTLD “.online” 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 name and the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.8 and 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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 name. 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 name 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 name. The Complainant has also denied any affiliation or association with the Respondent.

The additional term or character in the disputed domain name when used in conjunction with the Trademarks do not appear to suggest any alternative, secondary or generic meaning in the English language.

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.

Past panels often cite paragraph 4(b)(iv) as one of the circumstances to substantiate evidence of bad faith registration and use. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location, then this would justify a finding of bad faith.

The Panel is cognizant of the goodwill attached to the Trademarks. 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 name which is 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 name coupled with the term "web" and the selective choice of the gTLD "online" which would likely suggest to an Internet user that the disputed domain name resolves to a digital extension or online portal of the Complainant's CARREFOUR PASS financial services;
- (c) the manner in which the Respondent uses the disputed domain name that resolves to a passive website with a clear warning that the website is being reported for potential phishing activities;
- (e) the notoriety, fame and repute attached to the Trademarks which several WIPO panelists have concluded are well-known trademarks;
- (f) the likelihood of an attempt to conceal the identity of the Respondent by using privacy services at the point of registering the disputed domain name, given the well-known status of the Trademarks.

Having reviewed the record, therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 name <carrefourpassweb.online> be transferred to the Complainant

*/Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin/*

**Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 8, 2025