

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

### **Carrefour SA v. Louis Latour, Carrefour Spectacles, Guillaume Legrand Case No. D2026-1008**

#### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondents are Louis Latour, Carrefour Spectacles, France, and Guillaume Legrand, France.

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

The disputed domain name <carrefour-spectacles.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc., and the disputed domain name <spectacles-carrefour.com> is registered with Hello Internet Corp (the “Registrar(s)”).

#### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint as regards the disputed domain name <carrefour-spectacles.com> was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 9, 2026. On March 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <carrefour-spectacles.com>. On March 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0177639766) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 11, 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 a first amended Complaint on March 11, 2026.

On March 16, 2026, the Complainant submitted a request for addition of the disputed domain name <spectacles-carrefour.com> into the proceeding. On March 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <spectacles-carrefour.com>. On March 17, 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 (unidentified) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 17, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed a second amended Complaint on March 18, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 8, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 company and a worldwide leader in retail. Founded in 1959 and a pioneer of the hypermarket concept since 1968, the Complainant operates more than 14,000 stores in over 40 countries and employs more than 500,000 persons worldwide. The Complainant is listed on the CAC 40 index of the Paris Stock Exchange and reported total revenue of approximately EUR 87.2 billion in 2024. In addition to its retail business, the Complainant offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services, the latter being notably operated through its website at “www.spectacles.carrefour.fr”, an online ticketing platform allowing customers to book and purchase tickets for shows, sports, and leisure activities throughout France.

The Complainant is the owner of several hundred trademark registrations worldwide for the term “Carrefour”, as well as for marks comprising that term. In particular, the Complainant relies on the following registrations:

- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, duly renewed, designating goods and services in International Classes 1 to 34;
- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, duly renewed, designating services in International Classes 35 to 42;
- European Union Trade Mark CARREFOUR No. 005178371, registered on August 30, 2007, duly renewed, designating goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, and 38;
- French (INPI) trademark SPECTACLES CARREFOUR No. 97674944, registered on April 23, 1997, duly renewed, designating goods and services in International Classes 16, and 41.

The Complainant is also the holder of numerous domain names incorporating its trademarks, including <carrefour.com>, registered since 1995, and <carrefour.fr>, registered since 2005.

The disputed domain name <carrefour-spectacles.com> was registered on March 2, 2026. The disputed domain name <spectacles-carrefour.com> was registered on March 10, 2026.

According to the Registrar verification responses, <carrefour-spectacles.com> was registered in the name of Louis Latour, with the organization name “Carrefour Spectacles”, while <spectacles-carrefour.com> was registered in the name of Guillaume Legrand, both located in France.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, both disputed domain names resolved to websites reproducing the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademarks (both word and figurative) and imitating the Complainant’s official ticketing website at “spectacles.carrefour.fr”. In particular, the “About us” pages of the websites at the disputed domain names reproduced verbatim the corresponding page of the Complainant’s official site.

The evidence on record further indicates that access to the website at <carrefour-spectacles.com> triggered a security warning from the Google Chrome browser, suggesting that the website had been used for fraudulent activities, including phishing.

## 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its well-known CARREFOUR trademarks and reproduce in their entirety its earlier SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademark, with the addition of a hyphen and, for one of the disputed domain names, an inversion of the verbal elements that does not affect the overall impression conveyed.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names: the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, has not been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's trademarks, has used the disputed domain names to host a "rogue" website impersonating the Complainant, and has provided fanciful and/or inaccurate registration details, including the organization name "Carrefour Spectacles" and an address historically associated with the Complainant's headquarters area.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, in particular under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the Respondents having intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those websites, with strong indicia of phishing and impersonation.

### B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1 Procedural Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that several converging indicia support a finding of common control. First, the disputed domain names were registered within a very short timeframe, namely on March 2 and March 10, 2026, that is, eight days apart. Second, the disputed domain names follow an identical naming pattern, each combining the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark with the term "spectacles", separated by a hyphen, and registered under the same generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com"; the only structural difference between the two disputed domain names lies in the order of the verbal elements, which

suggests a deliberate symmetry rather than two independent registrations. Third, the disclosed underlying registrants are both said to be located in France, the country where the Complainant is headquartered and where its trademarks enjoy a particularly strong reputation.

In addition, and most significantly, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, both disputed domain names resolved to websites that passed them off as the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademarks (both word and figurative) and by imitating the Complainant's official ticketing website at "spectacles.carrefour.fr". The evidence on record establishes in particular that the "About us" pages of the websites at the disputed domain names reproduced verbatim the corresponding page of the Complainant's official site. The identical, coordinated use made of the disputed domain names further supports the conclusion that they were operated as part of a single scheme and under common control.

The Panel further notes that the registration of <carrefour-spectacles.com> was originally made through a privacy service and that, upon disclosure by the Registrar, the underlying registrant information includes an organization name ("Carrefour Spectacles") and a postal address that appear designed to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. The use of a privacy service for one of the disputed domain names, combined with the fact that the disclosed registrant details for that disputed domain name on their face seek to imitate the Complainant, does not preclude consolidation but rather reinforces the inference of an attempt to mask the identity of the same underlying actor.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any party. The Respondents have been duly notified of the proceedings at the contact details disclosed by the Registrars and have elected not to participate. Consolidation is, in the present circumstances, procedurally efficient, fair, and equitable.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain names are more likely than not subject to common control, and accordingly decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

## **6.2 Substantive Issues**

### **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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademarks CARREFOUR and SPECTACLES CARREFOUR for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark is recognizable within both disputed domain names, which incorporate that mark in its entirety. The disputed domain names also reproduce in their entirety the Complainant's SPECTACLES CARREFOUR mark, and the disputed domain name <carrefour-spectacles.com> doing so by way of an inversion of the verbal elements of that mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "spectacles" when considered solely against the CARREFOUR mark) may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The presence of the gTLD ".com" is generally disregarded for the purposes of this assessment. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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.

In particular, there is no evidence on the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. While the registration details for <carrefour-spectacles.com> include the organization name “Carrefour Spectacles”, the Panel finds that, on the present record, this information appears designed to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant rather than to reflect any genuine identity of the Respondent. Such manufactured registration data cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

The Respondent has not been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the CARREFOUR or SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademarks, and there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services or of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. On the contrary, the disputed domain names have been used to host websites which reproduce the Complainant’s trademarks and corporate content and which imitate the Complainant’s official ticketing website at “spectacles.carrefour.fr”.

The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain names, each combining the Complainant’s well-known CARREFOUR mark with a term (“spectacles”) directly descriptive of one of the Complainant’s actual lines of business, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

As regards registration in bad faith, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of, and with the clear intention of targeting, the Complainant and its trademarks. The CARREFOUR mark is highly distinctive and enjoys a long-standing and widespread reputation, in particular

in France where the disclosed registrants are said to be located, as has been recognized in numerous prior UDRP decisions involving the Complainant. The earliest of the Complainant's trademark registrations dates back to 1968 and predates the registration of the disputed domain names by nearly six decades. In addition, the disputed domain names do not merely reproduce the CARREFOUR mark in conjunction with a random term: they combine that mark with the term "spectacles", which corresponds precisely to the activity carried out by the Complainant under its dedicated SPECTACLES CARREFOUR mark and through its official ticketing website at "spectacles.carrefour.fr". Such a specific composition cannot be the result of mere coincidence and demonstrates that the Respondent had the Complainant and its services in mind at the time of registration.

As regards use in bad faith, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy is squarely applicable. By using the disputed domain names to host websites which reproduce the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademarks and imitate the Complainant's official ticketing website at "spectacles.carrefour.fr" – including by reproducing verbatim the "About us" page of that official site – the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those websites.

The Panel further finds that the use of the disputed domain names amounts to passing off of the Complainant. The fact that access to the website at <carrefour-spectacles.com> triggered a security warning from the Google Chrome browser provides additional support for the Complainant's contention that the disputed domain names have been potentially used for fraudulent activities, including phishing. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed passing off and phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel additionally notes that the use of manifestly false or misleading registration details – in particular, the organization name "Carrefour Spectacles" combined with a postal address apt to suggest an association with the Complainant – is a further indicator of bad faith, as it reflects an attempt to conceal the Respondent's identity and to frustrate the Complainant's efforts to enforce its rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6.

Finally, the registration of two confusingly similar disputed domain names within a short time frame, both of which have been used as part of a coordinated passing off scheme, supports a finding of a pattern of conduct under paragraph 4(b)(ii) 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 names <carrefour-spectacles.com> and <spectacles-carrefour.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Elise Dufour/*

**Elise Dufour**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 30, 2026