

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Xioebe Xioebe, Jones Pare
Case No. D2026-2334

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Xioebe Xioebe, United States of America ("United States"); Jones Pare, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com> is registered with Aceville Pte. Ltd.; the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 29, 2026. On June 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 2, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, 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 an amended Complaint in English on June 9, 2026.

On June 5, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English that the language of the registration agreement for <jocarrefour.com> is Chinese and that the language of the registration agreement for <jo-carrefour.pro> is English. On June 5, 2026, the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comments on the Complainant's request.

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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 Carrefour SA, a French multinational retail group founded in 1959. It operates one of the world’s largest retail networks, with more than 14,000 stores in over 40 countries. In addition to retail services, the Complainant offers banking, insurance, travel, ticketing, and e-commerce services.

The Complainant owns a large, longstanding international trademark portfolio for the mark CARREFOUR, including but not limited to, International Trademark Registration No. 351147 for CARREFOUR, registered on October 2, 1968, and International Trademark Registration No. 353849 for CARREFOUR, registered on February 28, 1969. Incidentally, the Complainant also owns numerous additional trademarks and domain names for, or including the CARREFOUR mark. The Panel notes that the CARREFOUR mark has also been explicitly recognised by numerous previous UDRP panels as being well-known and enjoying a substantial international reputation, including, for example, *Carrefour SA v. Mark Benode*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4819](#), and *Carrefour SA v. ADAM DIONISIO*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0421](#).

The disputed domain names <jocarrefour.com> and <jo-carrefour.pro> were both registered on May 11, 2026. Based on the evidence, <jocarrefour.com> resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark and branding and purporting to operate an official Carrefour online store, offering online shopping for groceries, electronics, home appliances, and other consumer products. In contrast, <jo-carrefour.pro> resolved to an error page. The Panel has reviewed the current use of the disputed domain names and notes that they continue to be used in the same manner.

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 CARREFOUR trademark, as they incorporate the mark in its entirety, preceded only by the letters “jo”, which Internet users are likely to understand as a reference to the country Jordan. According to the Complainant, the addition of these letters, the hyphen in the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro>, and the applicable Top-Level Domains do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant states that it has not authorised the Respondents to use its CARREFOUR trademark, that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names,

and that there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com> has been used for a website impersonating the Complainant and reproducing its branding, while the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro> resolves to an error page, neither of which can confer rights or legitimate interests.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that, given the longstanding and well-known nature of the CARREFOUR trademark, the Respondents could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain names. The Complainant further contends that the Respondents intentionally sought to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark through the operation of an impersonation website at the disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com>, while the passive holding of the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro>, viewed together with the surrounding circumstances, likewise supports a finding of bad faith. Finally, the Complainant further relies on the decision in *Carrefour SA v. Xioebe Xioebe, Babishteryantch Willene*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2637](#), involving one of the disclosed Respondents, as further support for its contention that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 First Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com> is Chinese, while the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro> is English. Pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, in the absence of an agreement between the Parties or unless otherwise specified in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding, submitting, among other arguments, that the disputed domain names comprise Latin characters only, that the website associated with the disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com> is directed at English-speaking users, and that one of the disclosed Respondents had previously participated in a UDRP proceeding conducted in English (*Carrefour SA v. Xioebe Xioebe, Babishteryantch Willene*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2637](#)), and that both disclosed Respondents are purportedly resident in the United States, further indicating their ability to understand and communicate in English.

The Respondents did not make any 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 has to exercise such discretion judicially 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, time 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 determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Second Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of the 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 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

The Panel has carefully reviewed all elements of this case, giving particular weight to the following elements and facts: (a) both disputed domain names consist of the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark together with the prefix "jo", differing only by the inclusion of a hyphen in the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro>; (b) both disputed domain names were registered on the same day, within approximately 19 minutes of one another; (c) both disputed domain names use the same name servers; (d) the disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com> resolved to a website reproducing the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark and branding and purporting to operate an official Carrefour online store, while the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro> resolved to an error page; and (e) the Respondents did not submit any arguments and did not contest this request for consolidation.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.3 Findings on the Merits

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 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "jo" and "jo-", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 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.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark. Further, there is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant in any way, or that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Panel also finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, based on the evidence, the disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com> was used to resolve to a website misrepresenting itself as an official Carrefour online store, prominently reproducing the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark and branding in a manner that falsely suggested an affiliation with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

As to the fact that the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro> resolves to an inactive page, the Panel finds that holding the disputed domain name passively, without making any active use of it, also does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privée.Com and Vente-Privée.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain names, combining the Complainant’s well-known trademark with the common country abbreviation “jo”, commonly used to refer to the country Jordan, further confirmed by statements including “FREE DELIVERY IN JOD” on the website the disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com> resolves to, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant by suggesting that the disputed domain name(s) identifies an official Complainant website for Jordan, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark. The CARREFOUR trademark had already been registered and used for many decades before the registration of the disputed domain names and has previously been recognized by UDRP panels as being well-known (see the cases cited above). While each case must be decided on its own facts, the Panel considers that the evidence in the present case supports a finding that the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark enjoyed global well-known status at the time the disputed domain names were registered, creating a presumption of bad faith registration on the part of the Respondent. Additionally, a simple trademark database or Internet search conducted prior to registration would easily have disclosed the Complainant's longstanding trademark rights. This conclusion is further confirmed by the subsequent use of disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com>, which indeed reproduces the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark and branding and purports to constitute an official Carrefour online store, clearly confirming that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain names.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has used disputed domain name <jocarrefour.com> to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website and the products and services offered on it. The website prominently displays the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark and branding, misrepresents itself as an official Carrefour online store for the Jordanian market. In the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that such conduct falls within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which constitutes direct evidence of use in bad faith under the Policy. In addition, panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including the operation of websites passing itself off as the Complainant, constitutes evidence of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

As to the fact that the disputed domain name <jo-carrefour.pro> resolves to an inactive page, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To 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 and well-known nature 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.

Finally, the Panel also notes that the Respondent was previously the respondent in *Carrefour SA v. Xioebe Xioebe, Babishterylantch Willene*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2637](#). Although each case must be decided on its own facts, the findings in that decision are consistent with, and provide additional context for, the Panel's conclusions in the present case.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes 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 names <jocarrefour.com> and <jo-carrefour.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026