ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. dovi kogba, SOKOBAF INVESTIMENTO
Case No. D2026-2572

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is dovi kogba, SOKOBAF INVESTIMENTO, Angola.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefourbusiness-ci.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (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 15, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 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 24, 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Anna Carabelli as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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

As per the evidence provided with the Complaint, the Complainant has been engaged in retail activities under the mark CARREFOUR for more than 60 years.

Founded in France in 1959, the Complainant is one of the largest chains of supermarket and hypermarket, with annual revenue in the tens of billions of Euros and more than 384,000 employees worldwide. The Complainant also operates a network of online stores that attract 1.3 million visitors per day.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for CARREFOUR in many jurisdictions, including the following:

- International trademark registration no. 191353, registered on March 9, 1956, in class 3;

- International trademark registration no. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, in classes 1-34;

- International trademark registration no. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, in classes 35-42; and

- European Union trademark registration No. 5178371, registered on August 30, 2007, in classes 9, 35, and 38.

The Complainant also owns domain name registrations consisting of the CARREFOUR trademark, including <carrefour.com> registered since 1995, <carrefour.net>, <carrefour.eu>, and <carrefour.fr>.

The Complainant has online presence through social media platforms with a large number of followers.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 3, 2026 and resolves to a parking page provided by the Registrar.

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:

- The Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is distinctive and globally recognized;

- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, since it consists of the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark with the addition of the general term "business" and of the element "ci" which is commonly understood as an abbreviation for the country Côte d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast);

- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since: (i) the Complainant has not authorized or somehow given consent to the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain name, (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and (iii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The composition of the disputed domain name falsely suggests an association with the Complainant, particularly in relation to the Complainant's commercial activity in Côte d'Ivoire;

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered it having in mind the Complainant's CARREFOUR mark. Passive holding, which is the case here, demonstrates bad faith; and

- The fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name through a privacy protection service to conceal its identity is further evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

Based on the above, the Complainant requests the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to decide the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four illustrative circumstances, which for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances any one of which, if found by the Panel, shall be evidence of the Respondent's rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy above.

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The addition of the Top-Level Domain, such as ".com", is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms (here "business" combined with the element "ci" separated by a hyphen), 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 name 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 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.

In addition, the disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar's parking page simply indicating that the disputed domain name can be managed through the registrant's Hostinger account.

There is therefore no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has made any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or that the Respondent is making legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without the intent to misleadingly divert Internet users from the Complainant's website and/or services. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Panel notes the nature of the disputed domain name as discussed in paragraph A. above, which appears designed to create confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

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 notes that the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark has been continuously and extensively used globally for many years and have, as a result, acquired considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide, as recognized by prior UDRP decisions. See *Carrefour v. Simon Lundgren* WIPO Case No. DAE2014-0001, *Carrefour v. Tucows Domains Inc. / Torsten Littmann* WIPO Case No. D2019-2328, and *Carrefour v. Tool Domains Ltd,* WIPO Case No. DGE2018-0002; *Carrefour SA v. Hugo Fernandez, Ricardo Contreras, Diego Maestre, Luis Hernandez, Santiago Miranda, Marcos Quintana, Manuela Ojeda, Salvador Mendoza, Santiago Navarrete, Esperanza Redondo, Enrique Barbero, Pablo Belmonte, Gerardo Casado, Pedro Cabrera, Bernardo Montes, Ernesto Villanueva, Cristian Aguilar, Eugenio Hidalgo, Javier Olivares, Rafael Lagos, Roberto Herrera, and Luis Villanueva* WIPO Case No. D2024-5144; *Carrefour SA v. Minha loja Admin, Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados, Minha loja Admin, TenisPro, and Atacalar Oficial, Carrefour - Las mejores ofertas en supermercados* WIPO Case No. D2025-3071).

In view of the well-known character of the CARREFOUR trademark, it is difficult to believe that the Respondent did not have in mind the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Prior UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's exact mark with the addition of the term "business" and of the element "ci" which could be interpreted as the country code for Côte d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast), suggests that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a deliberate intent to create an impression of an association with the Complainant, and to mislead Internet users into believing the disputed domain name was an official domain name of the Complainant.

As to bad faith use, the disputed domain name does not point to an active website and resolves to a Registrar's parking 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. 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. Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark; (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) use of false or incorrect contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). Taking the above factors into consideration, panels assess the overall plausibility of any (claimed) good faith use to which the domain name may be put in light of the composition of the domain name in relation to the relevant mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark as an internationally established mark, the composition of the disputed domain name as discussed above, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response. Taking these factors into account the Panel finds it implausible that the disputed domain name may be put into any bona fide use, 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.

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 <carrefourbusiness-ci.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anna Carabelli/
Anna Carabelli
Sole Panelist
Date: July 30, 2026