ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Carrefour SA v. Murat Yilmaz, Slytex, yahya kemal
Case No. D2026-2744

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Murat Yilmaz, Slytex, United States of America, and yahya kemal, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <carrefouruaeopportunities.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. The disputed domain name <labann-carrefour-uae.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC. Wix.com Ltd. and Squarespace Domains LLC are hereinafter referred to as the “Registrars”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 24, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 24 and June 29, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondents (Murat Yilmaz/Slytex, and Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 29, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 30, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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 based company and a worldwide leader in retail and operates stores around the world; it also offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services (Annexes 6 and 7 to the Complaint).

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations containing the mark CARREFOUR around the world, inter alia

- International trademark registration for CARREFOUR (word), Registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, duly renewed;
- International trademark registration for CARREFOUR (word), Registration No. 353849, registered on February 18, 1969, duly renewed; and
- European Union trademark registration for CARREFOUR (word), Registration No. 5178371, registered on August 30, 2007, duly renewed (Annexes 4-2 – 4-4 to the Complaint).

In addition, the Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names containing the mark CARREFOUR under generic and country code Top-Level Domains ("TLD"), e.g.<carrefour.com> registered 1995 and <carrefour.fr> registered 2005 (Annexes 5-1 and 5-2 to the Complaint); the Complainant has also a strong online presence on Facebook (Annex 7-1 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain names were registered for <carrefouruaeopportunities.com> on June 13, 2026 and for <labann-carrefour-uae.com> on June 7, 2026 (Annexes 2-1-1 and 2-1-2 to the Complaint). At the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain names did not resolve to websites with material content (Annexes 9-1-1 and 9-1-2 to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asks for consolidating the disputes against different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding since there is a set of indicators that suggest that the disputed domain names were registered by the same entity.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the distinctive and famous CARREFOUR mark because they incorporate the CARREFOUR mark in its entirety together with the terms "uae", "opportunities", and "labann". It is well-established case law that the addition of generic terms or letters - whether descriptive, geographical, meaningless or otherwise - such as "uae", "opportunities", and "labann", to a trademark in a domain name does nothing to diminish the likelihood of confusion arising from that domain name and that the hyphens are of negligible significance when assessing confusing similarity.

Further, the Complainant notes that the Respondents do not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not linked to the Complainant in any way whatsoever and have never been authorized by the Complainant to register domain names that are similar to its trademark. The Respondents are moreover not commonly known by or associated with the disputed domain names and do not use them for any bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith by the Respondents. The disputed domain names were registered decades after the Complainant has established rights in the mark CARREFOUR and this mark is distinctive and well known; hence, the Respondents must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights in the mark CARREFOUR when registering the disputed domain names. Further, a simple Google search for "carrefouruaeopportunities" or "labann-carrefour-uae" conducted from a browser virtually located in the country where the Respondents are allegedly resident, immediately returns results referring to the Complainant.

The Complainant moreover contends, that although the disputed domain names did not resolve to any active website at the time of filing the Complaint, the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith use under the doctrine of passive holding.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Procedural Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- the disputed domain names were registered within six days;
- the disputed domain names have a very similar naming pattern – both using mark CARREFOUR together with the geographic identifier "uae" for United Arab Emirates and an additional term;
- both domain names were registered under the ".com" TLD;
- at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain names did not resolve to any active website but evidence is available that both disputed domain names were originally used to resolve to the same website (Annex 9-2 to the Complaint);
- the registrant information provided by the concerned Registrars suggests that the disputed domain names were registered using fanciful and untruthful information (i.e. the city of "Tokat" is not in Alaska"); and

- finally, the Respondents did not react in any way to the proceedings – the Respondents neither objected to the consolidation request nor filed any Response.

Therefore, as regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain names are 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 with respect to the disputed domain names; and
(iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the mark CARREFOUR for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark in which the Complainant has rights since they incorporate the entirety of the mark CARREFOUR and only add the geographic term "uae" together with the term "opportunities" as well as "labann" plus two hyphens.

It has long been established under UDRP decisions that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, the mere addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. This is the case at present – the CARREFOUR trademark is clearly remains recognizable in each of the disputed domain names.

Finally, it has also long been held that TLD (in this case ".com") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the CARREFOUR mark in any manner.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain names, comprising the Complainant's mark CARREFOUR in its entirety together with the geographic term "uae" for United Arab Emirates, in which the Complainant is commercially present, is likely to mislead Internet users; this cannot be considered fair use – the opposite is the case: such conduct does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests.

Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names and has used or made any preparations to use the disputed domain names in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Respondent did not file a Response and hence has not rebutted the Complainant's contentions.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy (e.g. *Robert Ellenbogen v. Mike Pearson*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0001) both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent in bad faith, and
- the disputed domain names are being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

(i) The Complainant has established rights in the marks CARREFOUR decades before the registration of the disputed domain names. Furthermore, the Complainant is using the mark CARREFOUR as its primary domain name <carrefour.com>, to host its business website; the Complainant has also a strong Internet presence, especially on Facebook.

Because of the reputation of the CARREFOUR mark, it is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous trademark by an unaffiliated entity (as it is in the present case) can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Moreover, the addition of geographic term "uae" to the CARREFOUR mark in the disputed domain names rather strengthens the impression that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain names.

Finally, a simple online search for "carrefour" would have shown the Complainant and its marks. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.3.

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

(ii) Although the disputed domain names did not resolve to a website with material content, panels have also found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

Panelists look especially at the totality of the circumstances in each case, 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, and (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

All these aspects are present in this specific case, which is why there are no doubts as to the Respondent's bad faith.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <carrefouruaeopportunities.com> and <labann-carrefour-uae.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/
Peter Burgstaller
Sole Panelist
Date: August 10, 2026