ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. dora dora, fastusa
Case No. D2026-0566

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is dora dora, fastusa, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefourpassdigital.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 February 11, 2026. On February 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 13, 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 (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 February 16, 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 25, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Igor Alfiorov as the sole panelist in this matter on March 25, 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 Carrefour SA, a French public limited company founded in 1959 and a pioneer of the hypermarket concept. The Complainant operates globally with over 384,000 employees, 1.3 million daily visitors to its webstores, and annual revenues in the tens of billions of euros. It is listed on the Euronext Paris (CAC 40 index) and was a Premium Partner of the Paris 2024 Olympic Games.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS worldwide, all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Representative examples of its trademark rights include:

- International Trademark CARREFOUR, Registration No. 191353, registered on March 9, 1956;
- International Trademark CARREFOUR, Registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968;
- International Trademark CARREFOUR PASS, Registration No. 719166, registered on August 18, 1999.

The CARREFOUR mark has been recognized as well known in previous UDRP decisions. Furthermore, the Complainant has an extensive online presence through various domain names incorporating its mark, such as <carrefour.com>, <carrefour.fr>, and <carrefour.eu>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 27, 2026. According to the Complainant, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website. When accessed, it triggered a browser-generated security warning stating, cautioning that the website was dangerous. The alert, according to the Complainant, specified that the site might attempt to deceive users into installing software or revealing sensitive information, including passwords and credit card numbers. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name similarly resolves to a website which triggers a browser-generated security warning.

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 its well-known trademark CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS. It argues that the domain name incorporates its trademarks in their entirety and that the addition of the descriptive "digital" and "pass", and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".online" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, but rather enhances it by suggesting a digital service affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states it has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that its use, directing to a security warning page indicative of phishing, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the global fame of its CARREFOUR mark, it is not credible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Complainant argues that the registration was intended to create an association with the Complainant for commercial gain. Noting the security warning displayed, there is no plausible good-faith scenario in which the disputed domain name could be used without misleading Internet users and exposing them to a risk of fraud.

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS trademarks for the purposes of the Policy based on its numerous registrations. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS marks 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 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms such as "digital" or "pass" 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. It is a consensus view of UDRP panels that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the relevant trademark remains clearly recognizable. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The applicable gTLD ".online" is a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

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 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 confirmed it has no relationship with the Respondent and has not authorized the registration or use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name - which itself combines the Complainant's trademarks with the term(s) related to its digital financial services - to point to a webpage flagged for phishing or other malicious activities does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Respondent has not replied to the Complaint and has failed to provide any evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. The Panel therefore finds the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Thus, 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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is well known worldwide. The Respondent registered a domain name that is confusingly similar to this famous mark, adding terms ("pass" and "digital") that are directly associated with the Complainant's services. Given the global reputation of the Complainant's mark, the Panel finds it is not credible that the Respondent was unaware of it. The Panel therefore infers the Respondent more likely than not registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's rights and with the intention of creating a misleading association with the Complainant.

Having reviewed the record, which shows that an attempt to access the website at the disputed domain name triggers a browser security warning alerting users to potential phishing, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, 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 <carrefourpassdigital.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Igor Alfiorov/
Igor Alfiorov
Sole Panelist
Date: April 8, 2026