

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Heather Chapin

Case No. D2026-2567

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Heather Chapin, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefour-support.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 June 12, 2026. On June 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 15, 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 16, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Jonathan Agmon as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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 French public limited company and one of the world's leading retail groups. The Complainant was founded in 1959 and pioneered the hypermarket concept in 1963. The Complainant employs more than 384,000 people worldwide, attracts approximately 1.3 million unique visitors daily to its webstores, and generates annual revenues in the tens of billions of euros.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for CARREFOUR, including the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 191353 for CARREFOUR, registered on March 9, 1956;
- International Trademark Registration No. 351147 for CARREFOUR, registered on October 2, 1968;
- International Trademark Registration No. 353849 for CARREFOUR, registered on February 28, 1969;
and
- European Union Trade mark Registration No. 005178371 for CARREFOUR, registered on August 30, 2007.

The Complainant owns and uses domain names incorporating its CARREFOUR trademark, including <carrefour.com>, registered on October 25, 1995, <carrefour.net>, registered on June 18, 2001, <carrefour.fr>, registered on June 23, 2005, and <carrefour.eu>, registered on March 10, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 25, 2026. It resolves to a default web hosting page generated by the Plesk hosting control panel. The webpage displays the message "Web Server's Default Page" together with standard informational text indicating that the website has been successfully installed on the server and that no website content has yet been configured.

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:

- (i) The Complainant has established rights in the trademark CARREFOUR through numerous trademark registrations worldwide dating back several decades. The disputed domain name <carrefour-support.com> incorporates the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety. The trademark is immediately recognizable within the disputed domain name and constitutes its dominant and distinctive element. The addition of the term "support" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and instead increases the likelihood that Internet users will assume an association with the Complainant, given that customer support services are commonly offered by large international retailers like the Complainant;

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the CARREFOUR trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use; and

(iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The CARREFOUR trademark has also been recognized as well known in prior UDRP decisions. The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's longstanding and well-known CARREFOUR trademark when registering the disputed domain name, the composition of the disputed domain name demonstrates deliberate targeting of the Complainant. The combination "Carrefour Support" has no apparent meaning independent of the Complainant and its activities. The composition of the disputed domain name falsely suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant and therefore carries a high risk of implied affiliation. At the time of filing this Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves only to a default web hosting page generated by the Plesk hosting control panel. The website displays a standard server installation message and contains no genuine content, no bona fide offering of goods or services, and no legitimate noncommercial activity. The absence of active content does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 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.

The Complainant has established registered rights in the CARREFOUR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety. The trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, notwithstanding the addition of the hyphen and the descriptive term "support". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing-similarity analysis. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 that 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark rights corresponding to it. The disputed domain name resolves only to a default hosting page and is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the Complainant’s well-known trademark with the term “support”, carries a risk of implied affiliation by suggesting that it identifies an official support channel of the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

The Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark substantially predates the registration of the disputed domain name and has been recognized by prior UDRP panels as well known. The disputed domain name reproduces that trademark in its entirety and adds the term “support”, which is directly suggestive of a customer-service function associated with the Complainant. In these circumstances, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and targeted its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a default Plesk hosting page. 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. 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 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.

Further, the Respondent failed to participate in these proceedings and given the fame of the CARREFOUR trademark and the specific composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel is unable to conceive of any plausible good faith use that the Respondent could make of the disputed domain name.

Having regard to the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <carrefour-support.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonathan Agmon/

Jonathan Agmon

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2026