

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. benji beni
Case No. D2025 - 4575

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is benji beni, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name (hereafter the Disputed Domain Name) <carrefour-serviceclipass.org> 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 (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 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 10, 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 Isabelle Leroux as the sole panelist in this matter on December 8, 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, Carrefour SA, is a French multinational retail corporation and a worldwide leader in the retail sector. The Complainant pioneered the concept of hypermarkets in 1968 and currently operates more than 12,000 stores in over 30 countries worldwide. With more than 384,000 employees worldwide, the Complainant is a major and well-known global leader in retail. The Complainant is listed on the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40) and additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide consisting of or containing the word “CARREFOUR” and “CARREFOUR PASS”, including:

- French trademark CARREFOUR No. 1565338, registered on December 8, 1989, duly renewed, designating goods in international classes 1-34;
- French trademark CARREFOUR PASS No. 99780481, registered on March 12, 1999, duly renewed, designating goods in international class 36;
- International trademark CARREFOUR PASS No. 719166, registered on August 18, 1999, duly renewed, designating goods in international class 36;
- Brazilian trademark CARREFOUR PASS No. 821744739, registered on August 2, 2005, duly renewed, designating goods in international class 36;
- European Union trademark CARREFOUR No. 008779498, registered on July 13, 2010, duly renewed, designating goods in international class 35; and
- United States trademark CARREFOUR No. 6763415, registered on June 21, 2022, duly renewed, designating goods in international class 35.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names incorporating “CARREFOUR” and “CARREFOUR PASS”, including <carrefour.com> (registered in 1995), <carrefour.fr> (registered in 2005), <carrefourpass.com> (registered in 2010), and <carrefourpass.net> (registered in 2013).

The Complainant's notoriety is evidenced by its significant online presence, with more than 11 million followers on Facebook, approximately 6.2 million followers on TikTok, and over 740,000 followers on Instagram.

The Disputed Domain Name <carrefour-serviceclipass.org> was registered on October 13, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an error page and did not display any active content.

The Respondent is identified as benji beni, located in Nantes, France. There is no evidence of any relationship or correspondence between the Complainant and the Respondent prior to this dispute.

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 Complainant's well-known CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS trademarks. The disputed domain name reproduces the CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety in the leading position, followed by a hyphen and the term "serviceclipass". The addition of the term "serviceclipass" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as it is a descriptive term directly related to the Complainant's commercial activities. The term evokes a "service client" (customer service in French) combined with "pass", which is part of the Complainant's CARREFOUR PASS trademark. The generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".org" should be disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity analysis.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the Complainant's CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS trademarks. The Respondent is not a partner, distributor, or licensee of the Complainant, and there is no contractual or commercial relationship between the parties. The Respondent does not own any trademark registrations for CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to an error page, indicating no bona fide offering of goods or services and no legitimate non-commercial or fair use.
- The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the worldwide fame and long-standing use of the Complainant's CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS trademarks (the earliest dating back to 1990), it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration. A simple Internet search for "CARREFOUR" or "CARREFOUR PASS" yield results exclusively related to the Complainant. The composition of the Disputed Domain Name, particularly the inclusion of the French-language term "serviceclipass" (evoking "service client" or customer service), demonstrates that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to any active, legitimate website but rather to an error page. The Respondent's passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name, combined with the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, constitutes bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The Respondent likely registered the Disputed Domain Name either to resell it to the Complainant at a profit or to disrupt the Complainant's business.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) 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 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 marks CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS 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 “serviceclipass,” 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 term “serviceclipass” appears to be a combination of descriptive terms related to customer service (“service” and “cli,” a shortened form of “client” in French) and “pass”, which is itself part of the Complainant's CARREFOUR PASS trademark. This combination reinforces rather than diminishes the connection to the Complainant's trademarks.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.org” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent was not licensed nor authorized by the Complainant to use the latter's CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS trademarks. The Respondent does not own any trademark registrations for CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to an error page, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is using or preparing to use it for any bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The composition of the disputed domain name itself, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademarks CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS along with terms directly evocative of the Complainant's services (“serviceclipass”), further undermines any claim to legitimate interests. The Respondent has provided no explanation for the choice of this particular combination of terms, which so clearly targets the Complainant's trademarks and business activities.

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 given the worldwide fame and long-standing use of the Complainant's CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS trademarks, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration and being located in France. The Complainant's trademark registrations predate the registration date of the Disputed Domain Name by many years, indeed, by several decades in the case of the earliest CARREFOUR trademark (registered in 1990). The CARREFOUR trademarks are highly distinctive and enjoy substantial reputation globally, particularly in France, where both the Complainant and the Respondent are located.

The composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself provides compelling evidence of the Respondent's knowledge of and intent to target the Complainant. The Disputed Domain Name combines the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark with "serviceclipass", a term that clearly evokes the Complainant's CARREFOUR PASS trademark and its customer service operations. The use of French-language elements ("service" and "cli" for "client") is particularly telling given that the Complainant is a French company with its primary market in France, and the Respondent is also located in France. This cannot be mere coincidence.

A simple Internet search for "CARREFOUR" or "CARREFOUR PASS" yields results exclusively related to the Complainant, as evidenced in the Complaint. The Respondent's failure to conduct even a basic trademark search before registering the Disputed Domain Name is a contributory factor to bad faith.

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 distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain 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.

The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent could make any legitimate use of a domain name that so clearly incorporates and targets the Complainant's well-known trademarks. Any use of the Disputed Domain Name would inevitably create a false impression of association with the Complainant. The most plausible explanations for the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name are either an intention to sell it to the Complainant at a profit, to disrupt the Complainant's business, or to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. All of these scenarios 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 <carrefour-serviceclipass.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Isabelle Leroux/

Isabelle Leroux

Sole Panelist

Date: December 22, 2025