

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Name redacted
Case No. D2026-0457

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Name Redacted ¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 10, 2026, 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 February 12, 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 February 16, 2026.

On February 12 the Center informed the parties in French and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is French. On February 16, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

¹ The 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 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 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. A third-party sent an email communication to the Center on February 25, 2026, claiming identity theft. On March 5, 2026, the Center acknowledged receipt of the email and notified the parties.

The Center appointed Louis-Bernard Buchman as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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, a company registered in France and listed on the Paris Stock Exchange, pioneered in 1968 the creation of the first hypermarkets and has since grown to become one of the world leaders in retail goods sales. In 2024, it operated over 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide, with global net sales of EUR 85.4 billion. Besides retail, the Complainant offers banking, insurance, ticketing and travel services.

The Complainant owns a very large portfolio of trademarks containing the element CARREFOUR, including the International trademark CARREFOUR, registered under No. 191353 on March 9, 1956, and the International trademark CARREFOUR, registered under No. 351147 on October 2, 1968 (together hereinafter referred to as: “the Mark”).

The Complainant also owns many domain names related to its activities, incorporating the element “carrefour”, including the <carrefour.com> domain name, registered on October 25, 1995.

The disputed domain name <carrefour-frances.com> was registered on October 15, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolved to a parking page of the Registrar’s website. At the time of this decision, it does not resolve to any active website.

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 reproduces the Mark, in which it has rights, and is confusingly similar to the Mark insofar as the disputed domain name contains the Mark and that the element “frances” after the Mark (whether or not preceded by a hyphen) is not capable to prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Mark remains recognizable in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and never had any affiliation with the Complainant (which never authorized the Respondent to use the Mark in any manner).

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent had knowledge of the Mark and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, and is also using it in bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Aspects

A. 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 that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the facts that the disputed domain name resolves to a standard parking page automatically generated by the Registrar and that all visible content on this page, including messages such as "Someone has already reserved this domain name" and promotional information relating to registrar services, is displayed entirely in English.

Secondly, the Complainant contends that by selecting this Registrar and allowing the disputed domain name to resolve to English-language content, the Respondent has implicitly accepted the use of English in connection with the disputed domain name.

Thirdly, the Complainant asserts that having to translate the Complaint into another language would result in unnecessary delay and additional costs, without providing any corresponding procedural benefit to the Respondent, and that UDRP panels have consistently held that, where a respondent remains silent and the registrar's documentation and associated content are in English, it is both fair and procedurally efficient to conduct the proceeding in English.

Finally, the Complainant points out that the Respondent has taken no steps demonstrating any reliance on a language other than English, nor is there any indication that the use of English would prejudice the Respondent's ability to participate in the proceeding. By contrast, imposing another language would place a disproportionate burden on the Complainant, who already bears the costs of the administrative procedure.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

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 Select UDRP Questions \("WIPO Overview 3.1"\)](#), 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.

B. Failure to Respond

As aforementioned, no Response was received from the Respondent.

Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a default by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint.

The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstance in this case which would cause the Panel to proceed differently.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, it is the Complainant's burden to establish that all three of the required criteria for a transfer of the disputed domain name have been met, even in the event of a default.

Under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel is empowered to draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate under the circumstances.

In this case, the Panel finds that as a result of the default, the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant. In particular, by defaulting and failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, as discussed below, the Respondent has failed to provide any exculpatory information or reasoning that might have led the Panel to question the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted in bad faith.

6.2. Requirements of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 that the Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition in the disputed domain name of another term, such as "frances", may bear on the 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Regarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name, it is well established that a gTLD does not generally affect the assessment of a domain name for the purpose of determining identity or confusingly similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. 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. 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used 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.

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 Mark and the composition of the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Panel notes that the distinctiveness and reputation of the Mark have been confirmed by many prior UDRP panels (see for instance *Carrefour v. Yunjinhua*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0257](#); *Carrefour v. Park KyeongSook*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1425](#); *Carrefour v. VistaPrint Technologies Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0769](#); *Carrefour v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Robert Jurek, Katrin Kafut, Purchasing clerk, Starship Tapes & Records*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-2533](#); *Carrefour v. Jane Casares, NA*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0976](#); *Carrefour v. Jean-Pierre Andre Preca*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2857](#); *Carrefour v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2610](#); *Carrefour v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0155401638 / Binya Rteam*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2895](#) and *Carrefour SA v. Jamyz Baleck, Beneld Liis*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1491](#)).

Furthermore, some UDRP panels have held that in certain circumstances, registrants of domain names have a duty to abstain from registering and using a domain name, which is either identical or confusingly similar to a prior trademark held by others and which would infringe upon or otherwise violate the rights of a third party. See Policy, paragraph 2(b); *Nike, Inc. v. B. B. de Boer*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1397](#); *Nuplex Industries Limited v. Nuplex*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0078](#); *Mobile Communication Service Inc. v. WebReg, RN*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1304](#); *BOUYGUES v. Chengzhang, Lu Ciagao*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1325](#); *Media*

General Communications, Inc. v. Rarenames, WebReg, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0964](#); and *mVisible Technologies, Inc. v. Navigation Catalyst Systems, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1141](#).

The Panel 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 the third element of the Policy has been established.

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-frances.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Louis-Bernard Buchman/

Louis-Bernard Buchman

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2026