

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. 苏科 (ke su)
Case No. D2026-2024

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 苏科 (ke su), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefouronline-sales.shop> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English 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 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 18, 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 in English on May 19, 2026.

On May 18, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On May 19, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 20, 2026. In accordance with the

Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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 well-known worldwide leader in retail established in France. The Complainant is listed on the CAC 40 index of the Paris Stock Exchange with a total revenue amounting to approximately EUR 87.2 billion in 2024. The Complainant operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide.

Since 1995, the Complainant has operated its main website under the domain name <carrefour.com> to provide relevant information to investors and the public. The Complainant has also operated the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") name <carrefour.fr> since 2005.

The Complainant has a portfolio of trademark registrations for CARREFOUR marks, including the following:

- China Trademark Registration No. 789820 for CARREFOUR in Class 35, registered on November 7, 1995;
- International Trademark Registration No. 351147 for CARREFOUR in Classes 1 to 34, registered on October 2, 1968; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 353849 for CARREFOUR in Classes 35 to 42, registered on February 28, 1969.

The Respondent is purportedly an individual based in China. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on April 21, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CARREFOUR marks.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent has acquired no trademark in the term "carrefour" or "carrefouronline", is not commonly known by the disputed domain name as an individual, and has not received any license or authorization from the Complainant to use domain names incorporating the CARREFOUR mark. The Respondent has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as the disputed domain name was inactive at the time of filing the Complaint.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that, given the fame of the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademarks, the Respondent necessarily registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its

CARREFOUR trademarks in mind. This is further supported by the fact that the Respondent registered another domain name <carre-four-me.com> on April 29, 2026, eight days after the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complaint contends that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's earlier marks. In addition, by simply maintaining the disputed domain name, the Respondent is preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in the corresponding domain name which may not be considered good faith use. The combined circumstances above support a finding of bad faith in line with the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for the following reasons, including:

- The disputed domain name is solely composed of Latin characters rather than Chinese script, and clearly incorporate the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety together with the English words "online" and "sales". Additionally, the registration was carried out under a specific generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") which refers to the English term ".shop".
- The Complainant has no knowledge of the Chinese language, and translating the Complaint and conducting the proceeding in Chinese would incur considerable costs to the Complainant and will cause a delay of the proceeding.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel is obligated to do so judiciously in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, and the desirability of avoiding unnecessary delays and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel decides under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the CARREFOUR trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., “.shop”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded when assessing whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant’s trademark. Thus, the Panel disregards the gTLD in its application of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain name is comprised of the term “carrefouronline-sales”, which incorporates the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety. The inclusion of the other terms “online” and “sales” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing their rights in the CARREFOUR trademark and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their mark.

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.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR mark, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or has trademark rights in the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available records, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, it has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark. The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint and did not provide any information or factors that could potentially establish prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Under these circumstances, and taking into account the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark in its entirety and together with the terms “online” and “sales” which are associated with the Complainant’s field of commerce, is inherently likely to mislead Internet users by implying 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.

Based on the foregoing as well as the Panel’s findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trademark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the registration of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark, indicates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its trademark rights. The disputed domain name was registered more than five decades after the Complainant established rights in its marks. Given the high degree of fame of the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademarks, the Panel finds it improbable that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name was coincidental. The registration of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known CARREFOUR trademark, can by itself create a presumption of bad-faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

This conclusion is further supported by the Respondent's registration of a second domain name, <carre-four-me.com>, on April 29, 2026, eight days after the disputed domain name. The registration of two domain names incorporating the CARREFOUR mark indicates a pattern of conduct that will deprive the Complainant of the ability to use its mark in corresponding domain names, thus further supporting a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

With respect to the fact that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, panels have consistently found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the fame of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that, in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. (See, e.g., *TTS Tooltechnic Systems AG & Co. KG v. 苏科(suke, su ke)*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0366](#)).

Based on the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <carrefouronline-sales.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: June 29, 2026