

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. dai wei

Case No. D2026-0802

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is dai wei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefour-ae.store> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 25, 2026. On February 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 26, 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 / Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 26, 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 26, 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Igor Alfiorov as the sole panelist in this matter on March 30, 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, Carrefour SA, is a French retail company established in 1968. It is a global leader in the retail sector, operating more than 14,000 stores in over 40 countries, with a total revenue of approximately EUR 87.2 billion in 2024. The Complainant is commercially present in the United Arab Emirates, and owns the domain name <carrefouruae.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for its CARREFOUR mark, which predate the registration of the disputed domain name. These include, inter alia:

- International Trademark CARREFOUR, Registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968;
- International Trademark CARREFOUR, Registration No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969;
- European Union Trademark CARREFOUR, Registration No. 5178371, registered on August 30, 2007.

The disputed domain name <carrefour-ae.store> was created on February 15, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to an active website purporting to be an online grocery store named “carrefour-ae STORE”. The website under the disputed domain name lists a phone number and a physical address, both of which correspond to the Complainant’s actual customer care number and one of its store locations in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. At the same time, the website’s “About Us” page lists non-functional second telephone number and email addresses, [...]@carrefour-ae.ae and [...]@carrefour-ae.ae, referring to the currently unregistered domain name <carrefour-ae.ae>.

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 CARREFOUR trademark. It argues that the disputed domain name incorporates its mark in its entirety and that the addition of the geographical identifier “-ae” (for the United Arab Emirates) does nothing to diminish the the likelihood of confusion by suggesting an official online store for the Complainant in that region.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It states that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its mark, and the Respondent is not commonly known by this name. The Complainant argues that the use of the disputed domain name to host an online store cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the global fame of its mark and its specific presence in the United Arab Emirates, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant. The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the domain name to intentionally create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

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 entirety of the mark 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 term here, "ae", 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 3.1](#), 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 name. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

The Respondent, by its default, has failed to provide any evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

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 finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is of long-standing and enjoys significant global reputation, a fact established in numerous prior decisions. Given the mark's fame, particularly in the United Arab Emirates, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration.

This conclusion is decisively confirmed by the Respondent's specific knowledge of the Complainant's operations as the website under the disputed domain name lists the actual address of a Complainant's store in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, as well as its customer service telephone number. This demonstrates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant specifically as a target, intending to trade on its goodwill. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's mark and that the registration of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Respondent's bad faith is further evidenced by the composition of the disputed domain name itself, which combines the famous CARREFOUR mark with the geographic identifier "-ae". This demonstrates a clear intent to create a misleading association with the Complainant's retail operations in the United Arab Emirates.

These circumstances indicate that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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-ae.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Igor Alfiorov/

Igor Alfiorov

Sole Panelist

Date: April 13, 2026