

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CARREFOUR SA v. Eugenie Faraj

Case No. D2026-3777

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Eugenie Faraj, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefour-fr.shop> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 24, 2026. On August 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 26, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 26, 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 August 26, 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 August 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on September 22, 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 retail company operating internationally. Additionally, the Complainant offers travel, banking, insurance and ticketing services.

According to the Complainant, it operates more than 14,000 stores in over 40 countries and employs more than 500,000 people worldwide. In 2024, the Complainant reported revenue of approximately EUR 87.2 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for CARREFOUR, including:

- the International Trademark Registration for CARREFOUR (word trademark) No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968;
- the International Trademark Registration for CARREFOUR (word trademark) No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969; and
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for CARREFOUR (word trademark) No. 005178371, registered on August 30, 2007.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain names incorporating its CARREFOUR trademark, including <carrefour.com> and <carrefour.fr>.

The Domain Name was registered on August 22, 2026.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, at the time the Complaint was filed, the Domain Name resolved to a website in French displaying the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark and purportedly offering air-conditioning products for sale (the "Website").

As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name resolves to a webpage displaying a warning that the website may pose a security threat.

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 Domain Name.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the 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 the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence"; some panels have also expressed this as an "on balance" standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel's satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. See section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant holds valid registrations for the CARREFOUR trademark. The Domain Name incorporates this trademark in its entirety. As numerous UDRP panels have held, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The addition of the term "-fr" in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark. UDRP panels have consistently held that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" in the Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark. Thus, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the

notice of the dispute; or

- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

In the present case, the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark registrations predate the Respondent's registration of the Domain Name. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the CARREFOUR trademark or to register the Domain Name incorporating this trademark.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to the Website purportedly offering air-conditioning products of the type also offered by the Complainant and displaying the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark. Such use does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Prior UDRP panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the "Oki Data test" (see *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)), the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

In the present case, the above requirements are not met. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark together with the term "-fr", and resolves to the Website purportedly offering air-conditioning products for sale and prominently displaying the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark. The Panel notes that the Complainant itself offers air-conditioning units to its customers. In the circumstances of this case, the composition of the Domain Name, together with the content of the Website, points to the Respondent's targeting of the Complainant and its trademark, while the Website does not accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent's relationship, or lack thereof, with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not satisfy the cumulative requirements of the Oki Data test and does not confer on it any rights or legitimate interests.

In addition, prior UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including passing off or impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See section 2.13.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, there are no circumstances in evidence which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. In sum, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Complainant's rights in the CARREFOUR trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. This finding is supported by the incorporation of the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark in the Domain Name together with the term "-fr" (referring most likely to France, where the Complainant is based), as well as by the Respondent's use of the Domain Name in connection with the Website which prominently displayed the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark and purportedly offered air-conditioning products of the type also offered by the Complainant. The Website also refers to itself as "Carrefour Boutique" in its footer. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that, more likely than not, the Respondent registered the Domain Name with the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark in mind.

Moreover, the Panel is satisfied on the evidence before it that the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark is well-known and unique to the Complainant. Thus, the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, particularly given the use of the Domain Name for the Website purportedly offering air-conditioning products also offered by the Complainant and prominently displaying the CARREFOUR trademark. In sum, the Panel finds that, more likely than not, the Respondent registered the Domain Name with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark.

The Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent to attract Internet users to the associated Website. The content and overall presentation of the Website, including the prominent display of the CARREFOUR trademark, the purported offering of air-conditioning products also offered by the Complainant, and the use of French-language content, gave the impression that the Website was operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. Thus, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website.

For the reasons discussed above, the Panel finds 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 Domain Name <carrefour-fr.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: October 3, 2026