ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. csqddqs, google
Case No. D2026-3112

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is csqddqs, google, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carte-carrefour.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 15, 2026. On July 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 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 (Registrant Unknown, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 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 17, 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Emmanuelle Ragot as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 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 the proprietor of several hundred trademarks with the element "Carrefour" including:

- the international registration CARREFOUR no. 351147 registered on October 2, 1968, duly renewed in several classes 1 to 34;

- the international registration CARREFOUR no. 353849 registered on February 28, 1969, duly renewed in several classes 35 to 42; and

- the European Union Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO") trademark registration CARREFOUR no. 005178371 registered on August 30, 2007, duly renewed in several classes 9, 35, and 38.

The Complainant is one of the worldwide leaders in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets since 1968. With a revenue of approximately EUR 87.2 billion in 2024, the Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40). The Complainant operates in more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide. With more than 500,000 employees worldwide and millions of unique daily visitors in its stores, the Complainant is well known in the retail sector.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 28, 2026, and does not resolve to an active 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends, inter alia, that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier well-known trademarks.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier well-known CARREFOUR trademarks, which are entirely reproduced and immediately recognizable in the disputed domain name.

The addition of generic terms – whether descriptive, geographical, meaningless or otherwise- such as "carte" (French word meaning "card") would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The use of the lower-case letter format on the one hand and the addition of the Top-Level Domain ".com" on the other hand, are not significant in determining whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademarks of the Complainant. Similarly, the presence of a hyphen is of negligible significance when assessing confusing similarity.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the term “Carrefour” or terms similar thereto in the disputed domain name in any manner or form.

Regarding bad faith, the Complainant, inter alia, contends that the Complainant and its trademarks are so widely well known that it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not know the Complainant or its earlier rights.

The Respondent necessarily had the Complainant’s name and trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name cannot have been accidental and must have been influenced by the fame of the Complainant and its earlier trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for CARREFOUR.

The disputed domain name differs in its Second-Level Domain from the Complainant’s trademark CARREFOUR only by the adding of the term “carte” followed by a hyphen from the term “carrefour”.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark CARREFOUR.

The Complainant’s trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademarks CARREFOUR in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.
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.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks or any designations confusingly similar to its trademarks.

Furthermore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "carrefour" or "carrefour-carte" and that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given that the Complainant's mark is well known, UDRP panels have consistently held that, in circumstances such as the present case, the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. See, inter alia *Carrefour SA v. jean noel ballart*, WIPO Case No. D2023-2225.

This view is shared by the present Panel.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to make use of its marks or to register the disputed domain name.

Panels assess the overall plausibility of any (claimed) good faith use to which the domain name may be put in light of the composition of the domain name in relation to the relevant mark, such that, the more arbitrary or distinctive a mark the less plausible a claimed non-infringing good faith use is likely to be, and vice versa. The Panel does not find any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular disputed domain name without targeting the Complainant's trademarks. When registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent was most likely targeting the Complainant given that the latter offers payment services and membership cards to which the term “carte” in French, refers to.

Furthermore, it is the consensus view of UDRP panels that the apparent lack of active use of a disputed domain name, also known as passive holding, does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith.

On the contrary, looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panelists have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

Examples of cumulative circumstances found to be indicative of bad faith include the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, the fact that no response to the complaint has been filed, the registrant's concealment of its identity and use of fanciful registrant contact info. See, inter alia *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003 and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Such circumstances are also given in the present case.

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 <carte-carrefour.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Emmanuelle Ragot/
Emmanuelle Ragot
Sole Panelist
Date: September 4, 2026