

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Clementine Ortiz
Case No. D2026-2950

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Clementine Ortiz, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <qacareffoure.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 5, 2026. On July 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 13, 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 July 14, 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 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on August 14, 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 worldwide operator of retail and hypermarkets starting in 1968. The Complainant operates more than 12,000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide and additionally offers travel, banking, insurance, and ticketing services. The Complainant is listed on the Paris Stock Exchange and has more than 384,000 employees worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks for CARREFOUR worldwide including:

- International trademark registration No. 351147, CARREFOUR (word), registered on October 2, 1968, for goods in International Classes 1 to 34; and
- International trademark registration No. 353849, CARREFOUR (word), registered on February 28, 1969, for services in International Classes 35 to 42.

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain name registrations, including <carrefour.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 22, 2026. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website on which the Respondent offered a large number of goods in the name of “Carrefour UAE”.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <qacareffoure.com> is confusingly similar to its well-known trademark CARREFOUR, as it contains a misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark with the addition of the term “qa” which may be understood as a reference to Qatar.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Respondent is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. Rather, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that deliberately impersonates the Complainant, by reproducing the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark and logo, including its Arabic branding, and by presenting itself as an official Carrefour online retail platform targeting consumers in Qatar.

Finally, the Complainant submits that Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant and its trademarks are so widely well-known that it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant or its earlier rights to the CARREFOUR mark. The composition of the disputed domain name itself demonstrates that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant as it incorporates a recognizable misspelling of the CARREFOUR trademark, namely “careffoure”, preceded by the letters “qa”. Furthermore, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website that impersonates the Complainant and creates the impression that Internet users are accessing an official Carrefour online retail platform.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 and on the basis of the statements and documents submitted by the Parties.

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

- (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.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the burden of proving that all these elements are present lies with the Complainant. At the same time, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, the Rules, or any request from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate.

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. 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, "qa", 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for passing off 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.

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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name to host a website which, inter alia by reproducing the Complainant's trademarks and product images, gives Internet users the impression that the website is an official website of the Complainant. This is not the case, and the Panel therefore finds that the Respondent by registering and using the disputed domain name intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 name <qacareffoure.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2026