

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Carrefour SA v. paco manelas, perpe  
Case No. D2026-0345

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is paco manelas, perpe, American Samoa, United States of America (“United States”).

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

The disputed domain names <acceso-carrefour.com>, <carrefour-accesosapp.com>, <carrefour-accesosinfo.com>, <carrefour-gestionesweb.com>, <carrefour-soporteacceso.com> and <carrefour-soporteinicio.com> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 28, 2026. On January 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 29, 2026, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 2026, 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 January 30, 2026.

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 February 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Jacques de Werra as the sole panelist in this matter on March 13, 2026. 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 French public limited company established in 1959. It is one of the worldwide leaders in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1968. It operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries with more than 500,000 employees, and has millions of daily unique visitors in its stores. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for CARREFOUR (the “CARREFOUR trademark”):

- the International trademark CARREFOUR with registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, for goods in International Classes 1 to 34;
- the International trademark CARREFOUR with registration No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, for services in International Classes 35 to 42,
- the European Union trademark CARREFOUR No. 5178371, registered on August 30, 2007, for goods and services in international Classes 9, 35 and 38.

The Complainant operates its official websites at the domain name <carrefour.com>, registered on October 25, 1995, and at many additional domain names.

The disputed domain names were all registered between January 3, 2026, and January 19, 2026. Except for the disputed domain name <carrefour-soporteacceso.com> which redirects to the website associated with the domain name <credicentrocoop.com> which is the website related to a Puerto Rico, United States-based cooperative credit union named “Credicentro-Coop”, the other disputed domain names are not actively used and point to error pages (i.e., the disputed domain names <acceso-carrefour.com>, <carrefour-accesosapp.com>, <carrefour-accesosinfo.com>, <carrefour-gestionesweb.com>, and <carrefour-soporteinicio.com>).

#### **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.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its earlier CARREFOUR trademarks. In fact, the domain names incorporate in their entirety the above-mentioned trademarks together with the terms “acceso”, “accesoapp”, “accesosinfo”, “gestionesweb”, “soporteacceso” and “soporteinicio” (Spanish descriptive terms relating to access/login, web management and support services), separated by a hyphen.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. Firstly, the Complainant performed searches and found no CARREFOUR (or term similar thereto) trademark owned by the Respondent. From this finding, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has acquired no trademark in the term CARREFOUR (or term similar thereto) which could have granted the Respondent with rights in the disputed domain names. There

is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names as an individual, business, or other organization. Secondly, the Respondent has reproduced the Complainant's earlier registered trademarks in the disputed domain names without any license or authorization from the Complainant, which is a strong evidence of the lack of rights or legitimate interest. The Complainant submits that it has not authorized the use of its earlier trademarks or terms similar thereto in the disputed domain names in any manner or form. Thirdly, the Complainant puts forth that the Respondent has not, before the original filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the disputed domain names in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services. No active website is associated with the disputed domain names <acceso-carrefour.com>, <carrefour-accesosapp.com>, <carrefour-accesosinfo.com>, <carrefour-gestionesweb.com>, and <carrefour-soporteinicio.com>, and the passive holding of a disputed domain name is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The disputed domain name <carrefour-soporteacceso.com> redirects to the website "www.credicentrocoop.com" (a website related to a Puerto Rico, United States-based cooperative credit union named "Credicentro-Coop"). This use of the disputed domain name can only be explained as an attempt to disrupt the Complainant's business and attract Internet users to this website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Fourthly, since the adoption and extensive use of its trademarks by the Complainant predates by far the registration of the disputed domain names, the burden is on the Respondent to establish the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests the Respondent may have or have had in the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that it has made a prima facie case of the Respondent's lack of right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names, in line with the Policy. None of the circumstances which set out how a Respondent can prove rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, are present in this case. Considering all the elements mentioned above, the Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names that are the subject of the Complaint.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith, for the following reasons. Firstly, the Complainant submits that there is no doubt that the Respondent was well-aware of the existence of the Complainant and of its earlier rights. In fact, the Respondent was involved in a recent UDRP proceeding for the unauthorized registration of domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and the panel's decision was rendered on November 6, 2025 (two months before the registration of the disputed domain names). See *Carrefour SA v. samir bufallo, paco manelas, perpe, No Name, and Domain Admin*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3768](#). The Respondent necessarily had the Complainant's name and trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain names. The Respondent's choice of disputed domain names cannot have been accidental and must have been influenced by the fame of the Complainant and its earlier trademarks. Secondly, the Complainant submits that the Respondent chose the disputed domain names because of their confusing similarity to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and legitimate interest. This was most likely done in the hope and expectation that Internet users searching for the Complainant's services and products would instead come across the Respondent's disputed domain names. Such use cannot be considered a good faith use. Thirdly, the Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain names. In this regard, previous panels have established that knowledge of the Complainant's intellectual property rights, including trademarks, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, proves bad faith registration. A quick trademark search or search engine query, if really necessary, would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its trademarks. Fourthly, the current use of the disputed domain names may not be considered a good faith use. By simply maintaining the disputed domain names, the Respondent is preventing the Complainant from reflecting its name and trademarks in the corresponding domain names. In addition, five of the disputed domain names are currently not associated with any active website and they resolve to error pages. The non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The disputed domain name <carrefour-soporteacceso.com> currently redirects users to a third-party website and such use appears as an attempt to benefit from the renown and fame of the Complainant and its trademarks, disrupting the Complainant's activity and creating confusion in the mind of the Internet user of average attention. Fifthly, long-lasting international relationship of the Complainant and its trademarks, the Complainant cannot think of any future use of the disputed domain names that may be done by the

Respondent in good faith.

The Respondent has already been involved in prior UDRP proceedings, highlighting a pattern of cybersquatting conduct. The Respondent's bad faith is also evidenced by the registrant information provided by the Registrar. In fact, the Respondent's efforts to conceal his identity through the use of fanciful contact details (i.e., a street address such as "samoa add Around the area", and a zip code which does not exist for American Samoa, United States, etc.), in breach of the registration agreement, can be construed as further evidence that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms "acceso", "accesosapp", "accesosinfo", "gestionessweb", "soporteacceso" and "soporteinicio" 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 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

All the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the CARREFOUR trademark and combine it with Spanish terms related to digital and online related activities. This carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent has not denied the Complainant's allegations and has not provided any plausible explanation for the registration of the disputed domain names and for their intentions how to use them. In this case, it appears clear to the Panel that the disputed domain names have been registered targeting the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark in an attempt to confuse and attract Internet users to any potential future websites associated with the disputed domain names, or to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in corresponding domain names. Such conduct is not legitimate and cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered the six disputed domain names each of which feature prominently the distinctive trademark CARREFOUR of the Complainant so that it can be considered that the Respondent had the Complainant and the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark in mind when it registered the disputed domain names. The Panel further notes that the Respondent was a respondent in another recent UDRP case involving a domain name containing the CARREFOUR trademark in which the transfer of the disputed domain name was ordered. See *Carrefour SA v. samir bufallo, paco manelas, perpe, No Name, and Domain Admin*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3768](#).

On this basis, the Panel finds that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct of preventing a trademark holder from reflecting its mark in a domain name which already constitutes a sufficient ground for finding that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names 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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name <carrefour-soporteacceso.com> to redirect to the website associated with the domain name <credicentrocoop.com> which is the website related to a Puerto Rico, United States-based cooperative credit union named "Credicentro-Coop". Such use constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names <acceso-carrefour.com>, <carrefour-accesosapp.com>, <carrefour-accesosinfo.com>, <carrefour-gestionesweb.com>, and <carrefour-soporteinicio.com> 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 <acceso-carrefour.com>, <carrefour-accesosapp.com>, <carrefour-accesosinfo.com>, <carrefour-gestionesweb.com>, <carrefour-soporteacceso.com>, and <carrefour-soporteinicio.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Jacques de Werra/*

**Jacques de Werra**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 29, 2026