ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Paco Manelas, Perpe
Case No. D2026-2506

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Paco Manelas, Perpe, American Samoa, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carrefour-cuentas.com>, <carrefour-gestion-web.com> and <carrefour-ingreso.com> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 10, 2026 the Registrar 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 (Undisclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 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 June 12, 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 June 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Edward C. Chiasson K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 public limited company registered in the trade and companies register of Evry (France) under number 652 014 051. Founded in 1959, the Complainant is a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets. It has more than 384,000 employees worldwide, 1.3 million daily unique visitors in its webstores and annual revenues in the tens of billions of euros. The Complainant is a major and well-known worldwide leader in retail. It is listed on Euronext Paris (CAC 40 index) and was a Premium Partner of the Paris 2024 Olympic Games.

The Complainant also provides financial services via its CARREFOUR PAY and CARREFOUR PASS trademarks.

The Complainant owns a number of trademarks:

- International trademark Registration 353849 registered on February 28, 1969 in classes in 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42.
- European Union Trade Mark Registration 005178371 registered on August 30, 2007 in classes 9, 35 and 38.

The Complainant owns a significant number of domain names, including, for example, the following: <carrefour.eu> and <carrefour.fr>.

The Complainant also owns and uses the domain names <carrefour.net> (registered on June 18, 2001) and <carrefour.com> (registered on 25 October 1995).

The Complainant enjoys a significant online presence across multiple social media platforms, followed by millions of users worldwide. The Complainant provides the following data as a limited example of Carrefour's substantial online presence, with millions of followers across social media platforms: Facebook France 12 million followers; LinkedIn Global 1.2 million followers.

The disputed domain names were registered decades after the Complainant acquired trademark rights to CARREFOUR:

- May 26, 2026, <carrefour-ingreso.com>
- May 27, 2026, <carrefour-gestion-web.com>
- May 29, 2026, <carrefour-cuentas.com>

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name <carrefour-ingreso.com> did not resolve to an active website. Internet users attempting to access the disputed domain name were presented with a browser error message indicating that the server could not be found.

The disputed domain name <carrefour-gestion-web.com> resolved to a webpage generated by Cloudflare displaying the message "Sorry, you have been blocked".

The disputed domain name <carrefour-cuentas.com> resolved to a webpage generated by Cloudflare displaying the message "Sorry, you have been blocked".

The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the CARREFOUR trademark, whether as a domain name or in any other manner.

There is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that could give rise to any authorization, permission, or right by which the Respondent could own or use domain names incorporating the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names or by the term "Carrefour". The available WHOIS records do not identify any person, business, or organization corresponding to the disputed domain names and merely display privacy-protected information.

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 the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

As noted in section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), where a trademark is recognizable within a disputed domain name, the addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. Each of the disputed domain names reproduces the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety as its dominant and distinctive element.

As noted in section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the addition of descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or other terms to a complainant's trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The additional terms "ingreso", "gestion-web", and "cuentas" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, these terms are descriptive in nature and relate to account access, account management, or online administration. Internet users encountering the disputed domain names are likely to understand them as referring to online services, customer accounts, login portals, or administrative interfaces associated with the Complainant.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded when assessing confusing similarity pursuant to section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent is not authorized to use the Complainant's mark and is not known as "Carrefour".

The Respondent is not making any bona fide offering of goods or services through the disputed domain names. None of the disputed domain names has been used in connection with any legitimate commercial activity.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark when registering the disputed domain names. It is inconceivable that the Respondent selected the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

The disputed domain names are held passively by the Respondent, which does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

The composition of the disputed domain names appears deliberately calculated to create an association with the Complainant and its online services.

The Respondent registered three domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademark within a period of less than three days. The disputed domain names follow the same structure and naming convention and appear to form part of a coordinated registration strategy targeting the Complainant.

The Respondent has concealed its identity through a privacy service. While the use of a privacy service is not in itself evidence of bad faith, panels have consistently regarded such concealment as a relevant supporting factor where other circumstances indicate abusive registration

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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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, "ingreso", "gestion web", "cuentas", 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 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 the Respondent must have known of the Complainant's trademark. It was long outstanding and the appellant used it completely in 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.

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 or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names 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 names <carrefour-cuentas.com>, <carrefour-gestion-web.com> and <carrefour-ingreso.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edward C. Chiasson K.C./
Edward C. Chiasson K.C.
Sole Panelist
Date: July 29, 2026