# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. perpe, paco manelas, Dynadot Privacy Service
Case No. D2026-2878

## 1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are perpe, paco manelas, American Samoa, United States of America and Dynadot Privacy Service, , United States of America ("United States")..

## 2. The Domain Names and Registrar[s]

The disputed domain name <carrefour-cliente-ayuda.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar"). The disputed domain names <carrefour-clientes-acceso.com>, <carrefour-clientes-ayuda.com>, <carrefour-cliente-web.com>, <carrefour-portal-acceso.com>, and <carrefour-portal-usuarios.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 July 1, 2026. On July 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 2, 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 (Undisclosed) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 July 9, 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 July 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on August 11, 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, founded in 1959, is a widely-known operator of super and hypermarkets with more than 384,000 employees worldwide. The Complainant also provides financial services.

The Complainant has long-standing trademark rights in the CARREFOUR trademark. Among numerous others, the Complainant is the registered owner of the International Trademark Registration Nos. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, for CARREFOUR, covering various goods as protected in international classes 1 to 34, and 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, for CARREFOUR, covering various services as protected in classes 35 to 42.

The Complainant further owns multiple domain names comprising its CARREFOUR trademark, such as <carrefour.com> and <carrefour.net>.

All Respondents are reportedly located in American Samoa, United States, and in United States.

The disputed domain names were registered within a period of 10 days, namely on the following dates:

| | |
|---|---|
| <carrefour-cliente-web.com> | June 16, 2026 |
| <carrefour-portal-usuarios.com> | June 26, 2026 |
| <carrefour-clientes-ayuda.com> | June 17, 2026 |
| <carrefour-clientes-acceso.com> | June 16, 2026 |
| <carrefour-portal-acceso.com> | June 16, 2026 |
| <carrefour-cliente-ayuda.com> | June 18, 2026 |

At the time of the Complaint, three of the disputed domain names were not in active use, while the other three (namely <carrefour-cliente-web.com>, <carrefour-portal-usuarios.com>, and <carrefour-clientes-ayuda.com>) redirected users to a website at "www.credicentrocoop.com", purportedly 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.

### B. Respondents

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1. Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

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

The two 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.

In light of the criteria set out above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has provided unrebutted evidence that all disputed domain names are likely under common control for the following reasons:

The disputed domain names were registered within a period of only ten days between June 16 and 26, 2026. Three of them redirected users to the same third-party website. 5 out of 6 disputed domain names were registered by one registrar while the remaining disputed domain name was registered by a second registrar. Furthermore, the disputed domain names provide for a similar nature and composition pattern, all of them comprising the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark in combination with a dictionary term in Spanish respectively.

The Panel concludes that the Respondents are more likely than not somehow connected. Hence, the Panel accepts that all six disputed domain names are under common control.

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 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and

(iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2007-1228.

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1 and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

**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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the CARREFOUR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the CARREFOUR mark is reproduced within all of the respective disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the CARREFOUR mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here various dictionary terms in the Spanish language indicating customer services respectively online access (namely "cliente", "clientes", "portal", "usuarios", "ayuda", "acceso" and in one case additionally the term "web"), 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 names and the CARREFOUR 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 names. Particularly, the Complainant put forward that the Respondent is neither a business partner of the Complainant nor a licensee of its CARREFOUR trademark and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the term "carrefour" in combination with dictionary terms as used in the disputed domain names.

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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In this regard, the Panel particularly notes that the composition and nature of the disputed domain names, all of them comprising the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark together with dictionary terms in the Spanish language relating to customer services and/or online access services, indicates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark, and hence, its illicit intent to take unfair advantage of such, which does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent.

The Panel also notes that, while three of the disputed domain names have apparently not resolved to active websites yet, three disputed domain names redirected users to a third party website purportedly offering financial services, which additionally does not support a finding of any rights or legitimate interests under the circumstances of this case.

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.

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 the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have had the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain names, particularly considering the nature and composition of the disputed domain names. It is obvious to the Panel that the Respondent has deliberately chosen the disputed domain names, which are confusingly similar to the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark and additionally comprise dictionary customer service and online access terms, to target and benefit from the reputation of the Complainant. Consequently, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith.

As regards bad faith use, the Panel notes that at the time of the Decision the disputed domain names <carrefour-cliente-web.com>, <carrefour-portal-usuarios.com>, and <carrefour-clientes-ayuda.com> were used to redirect users to a third-party website purportedly offering financial services, which apparently compete with the services offered by the Complainant. In view of the Panel, this is sufficient evidence that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, misled Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the associated website.

The fact that the other three disputed domain names have so far not resolved to active websites does not prevent a finding of bad faith. 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. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the longstanding reputation of the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark, the inherently misleading composition of the disputed domain names, and the unlikeliness of any good faith use of the disputed domain names and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

All in all, the Panel concludes the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes 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 names <carrefour-cliente-ayuda.com>, <carrefour-clientes-acceso.com>, <carrefour-clientes-ayuda.com>, <carrefour-cliente-web.com>, <carrefour-portal-acceso.com>, <carrefour- portal-usuarios.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Kaya Köklü/*
**Kaya Köklü**
Sole Panelist
Date: August 25, 2026