ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Antonio carlos
Case No. D2026-2590

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Antonio carlos, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carreforargentina.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 15, 2026. On June 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 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 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 Yuri Chumak as the sole panelist in this matter on July 28, 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 public limited company established in 1959. It operates over 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries and employs over 384,000 individuals. Its online platforms attract over 1.3 million unique visitors daily, and its annual turnover is approximately EUR 80 billion.

The Complainant provides a broad range of services, including retail and financial products. In particular, it offers branded financial services under the CARREFOUR PAY and CARREFOUR PASS trademarks.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations for the CARREFOUR mark. Representative registrations include:

- CARREFOUR, International Registration No. 191353, registered March 9, 1956;
- CARREFOUR, International Registration No. 351147, registered October 2, 1968; and
- CARREFOUR, International Registration No. 353849, registered February 28, 1969.

These registrations cover a wide array of goods and services across numerous classes.

The Complainant also owns a portfolio of domain names incorporating its trademark, including <carrefour.eu>, <carrefour.fr>, <carrefour.com>, and <carrefour.net>. These are used in connection with its commercial operations and corporate communications. The Complainant further maintains an extensive presence on social media, with millions of followers, including over 12 million on Facebook France and more than 1.2 million on LinkedIn.

The Complainant submits that its CARREFOUR mark is widely recognized and well-known. Prior UDRP decisions have acknowledged the reputation of the CARREFOUR trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a default WordPress webpage displaying the headings “My Blog” and “Blog” and the automatically generated post “Hello world!”. The page does not identify any business or provide any substantive content or offering of goods or services.

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 is confusingly similar to the CARREFOUR mark. The element “carrefor” is an obvious misspelling of CARREFOUR, differing only through the omission of the letter “u”. The addition of the geographical term “Argentina” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and instead reinforces an apparent association with the Complainant’s operations in Argentina. The generic Top-Level Domain “.com” should be disregarded in the comparison.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized to use the CARREFOUR mark and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The default WordPress webpage does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The composition of the disputed domain name also falsely suggests that it is associated with the Complainant's activities in Argentina.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and the CARREFOUR mark is well known. According to the Complainant, the deliberate misspelling of the mark, combined with the geographical term "Argentina", demonstrates that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant. The Complainant further submits that the default WordPress page amounts to non-substantive use and that the circumstances support a finding of bad faith under the passive holding doctrine.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The omission of the letter "u" results in an obvious misspelling of the mark and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

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

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized to use the CARREFOUR mark or that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves only to a default WordPress installation containing automatically generated content. Such use does not demonstrate a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Moreover, the disputed domain name combines a readily recognizable misspelling of the CARREFOUR mark with the geographical term "argentina". Given the Complainant's operations in Argentina, Internet users may not notice the subtle misspelling in this composition and may consider the disputed domain name to be affiliated with the Complainant.

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 trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several decades. The Panel also accepts, based on the available record and the numerous prior UDRP decisions submitted by the Complainant, that the CARREFOUR mark is well known.

The disputed domain name consists of an obvious misspelling of the CARREFOUR mark together with the geographical term "Argentina", corresponding to a country in which the Complainant operates. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name was not coincidental. The composition of the disputed domain name supports the inference that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant and its CARREFOUR mark when registering the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

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 disputed domain name resolves only to a default WordPress installation containing automatically generated content. The page does not demonstrate any substantive use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including use limited to 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 the circumstances, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the 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.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and 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 <carreforargentina.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuri Chumak/
Yuri Chumak
Sole Panelist
Date: August 5, 2026