

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour S.A v. Dynadot Privacy Service
Case No. D2026-1377

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Carrefour S.A, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Dynadot Privacy Service, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefourpassweb.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 31, 2026. On April 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 9, 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/Dynadot, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 9, 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 April 10, 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 April 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Leo (Yi) Liu as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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 worldwide leader in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1968. The Complainant operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide, and has more than 500,000 employees worldwide. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for CARREFOUR and CAREFOURPASS in numerous jurisdictions, including:

- International Registration No. 351147 for CARREFOUR in Classes 1 through 34, registered on October 2, 1968;
- International Registration No. 353849 for CARREFOUR in Classes 35 through 42, registered on February 28, 1969;
- International Registration No. 719166 for CARREFOUR PASS in Class 36, registered on August 18, 1999; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 5178371 for CARREFOUR in Classes 9, 35 and 38, registered on August 30, 2007.

The Complainant also operates the domain names <carrefour.com>, <carrefour.fr> and <pass-carrefour.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on March 24, 2026. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any active webpage.

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 domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS trademarks;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- the domain name was registered and is being used 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.

Based on the record submitted, 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, despite the addition of the term "web" at the end of the disputed domain name, the CARREFOUR and/or CARREFOUR PASS marks are 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.

Although the addition of "web" 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.

As shown by the record, the Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence that it has engaged in any use of or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name - which only adds "web" to the Complainant's trademark CARREFOUR PASS - in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Furthermore, where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (here "web"), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 or 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 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 disputed domain name was registered many years after the registration of the Complainant's trademarks. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any active webpage currently.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On 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 trademarks, the composition of the disputed domain name (adding the term "web" to the Complainant's distinctive trademark), and the lack of response, and finds that in this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name 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 name <carrefourpassweb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Leo (Yi) Liu/

Leo (Yi) Liu

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026