

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. kubilay yıldırım
Case No. D2026-2612

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is kubilay yıldırım, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lecarrefour-algerie.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 16, 2026. On June 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki 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 a French company listed on Euronext Paris. Founded in 1959, the Complainant is active in the field of super markets and 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 EUR. The Complainant operates in numerous countries, including Türkiye, and Algeria. The Complainant was a Premium Partner of the Paris 2024 Olympic Games and enjoys a significant online presence with 12 million followers for its Facebook France page.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for CARREFOUR including the International trademark registration No. 191353, CARREFOUR (word), registered on March 9, 1956 for goods in international class 3 and the International trademark registration No. 351147, CARREFOUR (word), registered on October 2, 1968 for goods in international classes 1-34.

The Complainant also owns domain name registrations for CARREFOUR including the domain name <carrefour.fr> registered on June 23, 2005 and the domain name <carrefour.eu> registered on March 10, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 5, 2026 and at the time of filing of the Complaint resolved to an active website written in Turkish (the Website), which promoted escort services in Ankara, Türkiye. The homepage contained numerous references to escort services, meeting arrangements, escort profiles, and adult-oriented content. The website also included references to various districts of Ankara, Türkiye and presented itself as a directory or promotional platform for escort services. Currently the disputed domain name leads to an inactive website.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain name:

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

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "le", "algerie" and the 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 generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); and *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

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.

On the contrary, as the Complainant demonstrated, the disputed domain name was used to host the Website which promoted escort services. The Respondent was therefore using the Complainant's marks to increase traffic in its own Website.

In addition, the disputed domain name incorporates entirely the Complainant's mark and thus carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon the Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

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.

Because the Complainant's mark had been widely used and registered by the Complainant before the disputed domain name registration and noting the worldwide notoriety of the CARREFOUR trademark, it is clear that the Respondent had the Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

As regards bad faith use, the Complainant demonstrated that the disputed domain name is employed to host a Website which promotes escort services. The disputed domain name has been operated by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and business. This supports the finding of bad faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1.

Last, the Panel considers the apparent concealment of the disputed domain name holder's identity through use of a privacy shield at the time of filing the complaint, to be further indicative of bad faith (*BHP Billiton Innovation Pty Ltd v. Domains By Proxy LLC / Douglass Johnson*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0364](#)).

Under these circumstances and on this record, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used 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 <lecarrefour-algerie.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: August 11, 2026