ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CARREFOUR SA v. perpe, paco manelas
Case No. D2026-2660

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is perpe, paco manelas, American Samoa, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <carrefour-acceso-cliente.com>, <carrefour-cliente-acceso.com>, <carrefour-cuenta.com>, <carrefour-cuentas-web.com>, <carrefour-ingreso-cuenta.com>, <carrefour-ingreso-portal.com>, < carrefour-portal-web.com>, and <carrefour-soporte-inicio.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 18, 2026. On June 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 24, 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 (Redacted For Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 24, 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 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Benoit Van Asbroeck as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 mainly active in the retail sector. It was founded in 1968 and has more than 14,000 retail locations, including supermarkets, in more than 40 countries worldwide, including the United States. The Complainant additionally offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services.

The Complainant is the owner of registered trademarks worldwide in CARREFOUR, amongst which:

- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, covering goods in international classes 1 to 34;

- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, covering services in international classes 35 to 42; and

European Union trademark CARREFOUR No. 5178371, registered on August 30, 2007, covering goods and services in international classes 9, 35 and 38 The above trademarks will be collectively referred to as the “CARREFOUR trademarks”.

In addition, the Complainant has registered and is using multiple domain names containing the CARREFOUR trademarks, amongst which <carrefour.com> and <carrefour.es>, further evidencing its long-standing and consistent online presence under the CARREFOUR trademarks.

The disputed domain names <carrefour-acceso-cliente.com>, <carrefour-cliente-acceso.com>, <carrefourcuenta.com>, <carrefour-cuentas-web.com>, <carrefour-ingreso-cuenta.com>, <carrefour-ingresoportal.com>, <carrefour-portal-web.com> and <carrefour-soporte-inicio.com> were registered by the Respondent between June 1 and 12, 2026, well after the Complainant first secured rights in the marks.

At the time of the Complaint, six disputed domain names were not in active use, while two (<carrefour-cliente-acceso.com> and <carrefour-soporte-inicio.com>) redirected to another domain name: the Spanish-language website “https://credicentroscoop.com”, offering credit 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 names.

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its CARREFOUR trademarks, as each of the disputed domain names incorporates the CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety, combined with Spanish-language generic terms and phrases such as “acceso cliente” (client access), “cuenta” (account), “cuentas web” (web accounts), “ingreso” (login/entry), “portal”, and “soporte inicio” (support/home). The Complainant argues that adding these Spanish-language generic or descriptive terms —frequently applied to website titles, subdomains and subpages— does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant also claims that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” should be disregarded for the purposes of this assessment.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Indeed, it claims that it never authorised the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. The Complainant further states that the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain names, does not hold any registered trademark rights therein, and has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, any of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Moreover, the Complainant argues that the composition of the disputed domain names is indicative of an attempt to impersonate the Complainant or to falsely suggest an affiliation with or sponsorship by the Complainant, which precludes any finding of legitimate interest. Finally, the Complainant asserts that the redirection from the disputed domain names to other domain names offering money lending and credit services, in direct competition with its own financial and lending services, precludes the existence of right or legitimate interests of the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Complainant also argues that the Respondent's prior conduct and misuse of CARREFOUR trademarks establish a pattern of bad faith conduct within the meaning of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. Further, the Complainant submits that these findings are not precluded by the circumstance that most of the disputed domain names are passively held (resolving to blank or error pages). Finally, the Complainant further relies on third-party information alleging at least one of the disputed domain names was used for phishing purposes.

The Complainant requests the transfer of all eight disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed:

(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.

The Panel notes that, in accordance with paragraphs 14(a) and 14(b) of the Rules, where a party fails to comply with any time period laid down by the Rules, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate and is entitled to decide a proceeding based upon the Complaint alone. As the Respondent has not submitted any Response, the Panel may accept as true all reasonable factual allegations made by the Complainant.

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 holds registered rights in the CARREFOUR trademarks in numerous jurisdictions. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has well-established rights in the CARREFOUR trademarks.

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 trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.).

Each of the disputed domain names reproduces the CARREFOUR trademark in full, and merely appends Spanish-language descriptive or generic terms such as “acceso cliente”, “cuenta”, “cuentas web”, “ingreso”, “ingreso portal”, “portal web”, and “soporte inicio”. The addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity(WIPO Overview 3.1., section 1.8). In addition, the gTLD suffix “.com” is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded for the purposes of this comparison (WIPO Overview 3.1., section 1.11.1).

The Panel therefore finds that each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark, and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established in relation to each of the disputed domain names.

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, panel has 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 failed to rebut 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.

Amongst others, the Complainant indicates that (i) it never authorised the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark, (ii) that the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain names and does not hold any registered trademark rights therein, and (iii) that the Respondent has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, any of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Indeed, most of the disputed domain names resolve to blank or error pages, while the only two disputed domain names which were active redirected to a third-party website, offering credit services. Such use cannot be considered a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, nor a bona fide offering of goods and services since redirecting to a competing website does not convey rights or legitimate interests (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.3.). The composition of the disputed domain names — reproducing the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety while adding terms evoking customer account access, login portals, and support pages— strongly suggests an intent to impersonate the Complainant or to exploit the CARREFOUR trademarks for commercial gain, which is irreconcilable with any legitimate interest.

Finally, the Complainant further relies on third-party information alleging at least one of the disputed domain names was used for phishing purposes. Without having been able to confirm the legitimacy of this information, the Panel recalls that the use of a domain name for phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1).

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established in relation to each of the disputed domain names.

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.

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).

In assessing the bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names, the Panel will distinguish between the six disputed domain names which have remained inactive and the two disputed domain names which were used for redirection purposes.

As regards the disputed domain names used for redirection purposes (<carrefour-cliente-acceso.com> and <carrefour-soporte-inicio.com>), the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the website, "https://credicentroscoop.com", ostensibly offering services which compete with the services offered by the Complainant, by relying on the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademarks. As a result, the Panel finds that the respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

As regards the remaining disputed domain names, which were inactive at the time of the Complaint, 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, specifically the composition of the disputed domain name, the pattern of bad faith conduct demonstrated by the Respondent in registering domain names incorporating CARREFOUR trademarks and the concurrent use of two disputed domain names for bad faith redirection purposes, the Panel finds that the inactive disputed domain names were also registered and used bad faith under the Policy.

In addition, Complainant relies on third-party information alleging that the domain name <carrefour-ingreso-cuenta.com> was used — via the subdomain <pass.carrefour-ingreso-cuenta.com> — in connection with an SMS phishing campaign impersonating the Complainant's "CarrefourPASS" service and targeting consumers with fraudulent messages regarding a purported credit card transaction. The use of a disputed domain name in connection with phishing activity is a paradigmatic example of bad faith use, representing a deliberate attempt to deceive Internet users and to cause harm to both the Complainant and consumers (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4). This further supports the Panel's finding that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names occurred in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy in relation to each of the disputed domain names.

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-acceso-cliente.com>, <carrefour-cliente-acceso.com>, <carrefour-cuenta.com>, <carrefour-cuentas-web.com>, <carrefour-ingreso-cuenta.com>, <carrefour-ingreso-portal.com>, < carrefour-portal-web.com>, and <carrefour-soporte-inicio.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Benoit Van Asbroeck/
Benoit Van Asbroeck
Sole Panelist
Date: August 6, 2026