

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. suke, su ke
Case No. D2026-2019

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is suke, su ke, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carre-four-me.com> is registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co.,Ltd (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 11, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 12, 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 May 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 May 13, 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 May 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Moonchul Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 the French company Carrefour SA found in 1968, one of the worldwide leaders in retail, and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets. The Complainant is listed on the Paris Stock Exchange, operates more than 14,000 stores in over 40 countries worldwide, and employs more than 500,000 employees worldwide. The Complainant also offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services.

The Complainant owns a large portfolio of the trademarks CARREFOUR which were registered in numerous jurisdictions, including as follows:

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

The disputed domain name was registered on April 29, 2026. The disputed domain name has previously resolved to a website displaying the CARREFOUR mark and offering various products for sale. The Complainant has also furnished evidence showing that an attempt to access the website at the disputed domain name triggers a warning indicating that the website has been reported for potential 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.

The Complainant contends that:

(a) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark CARREFOUR in which the Complainant has rights, as the disputed domain name incorporates the CARREFOUR trademark in a hyphenated form ("carre-four"), in addition to the letters "me" separated by another hyphen.

(b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has previously resolved to a website displaying the CARREFOUR mark to impersonate the Complainant. The Respondent has not used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

(c) the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. Considering the Complainant's trademark is widely known, it is evident that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website to impersonate the Complainant and which is being used with malicious intention in order to misleadingly divert consumers to his website. Finally, the Respondent has been involved in prior UDRP proceedings, highlighting a pattern of cybersquatting conduct.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must demonstrate that the three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. These elements are that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark or service mark; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 names. 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 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 disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark CARREFOUR in the entirety with the addition of a hyphen and the term "me" separated by another hyphen. 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. In addition, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms here, the term "me", 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.

Therefore, 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. Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the overall burden of proof is on the Complainant. However, once the Complainant presents a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, 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.

Firstly, the Complainant contends that it has not given the Respondent permission or authorization to use its CARREFOUR mark, yet the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name which includes the Complainant's trademark.

Secondly, the Respondent's website has previously used the Complainant's CARREFOUR for offering for sale various products, without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant, which does not amount to a bona fide offering.

Thirdly, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Respondent's use of CARREFOUR mark when registering the disputed domain name does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of the case. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the disputed domain name has "been registered and is being used in bad faith". Thus, for the Complainant to succeed, a UDRP panel must be satisfied that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. These requirements are conjunctive; each must be proven, otherwise the Complaint fails. In addition, 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.

Firstly, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark CARREFOUR in its entirety with the addition of a hyphen and the term "me" separated by another hyphen. Considering the Complainant's trademark is widely known, it is clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark and targeted it at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel considers it is bad faith registration that the Respondent deliberately chose the disputed domain name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark as to the source or endorsement of its website.

Secondly, as earlier mentioned, the Respondent's website under the disputed domain name has used the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark for offering for sale various products, without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant. The Panel finds that such use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Further, the Complainant has also furnished evidence showing that an attempt to access the website at the disputed domain name triggers a warning indicating that the website has been reported for potential phishing. In this regard, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Further, the Panel finds that the Respondent has a pattern of bad faith conduct by registering domain name incorporating third-party trademarks and was involved in other UDRP cases (see *TTS Tooltechnic Systems AG & Co. KG v. 苏科(suke, su ke)*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0366](#)). Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that 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 <carre-four-me.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Moonchul Chang/

Moonchul Chang

Sole Panelist

Date: June 23, 2026