

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CARREFOUR SA v. Mst Hosne Ara

Case No. D2026-3784

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Mst Hosne Ara, Israel.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefuronlinemarkt.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 25, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 25, 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 (Redacted) 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 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Martin Svorčík as the sole panelist in this matter on September 24, 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 retail company, established in 1968, operating internationally and one of the global leaders in the retail sector with a total revenue of approximately EUR 82 billion in 2025. It operates more than 15,000 stores in over 40 countries.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for CARREFOUR, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 351147 for CARREFOUR, registered on October 2, 1968, covering goods in Classes 1 to 34;
- International Trademark Registration No. 353849 for CARREFOUR, registered on February 28, 1969, covering services in Classes 35 to 42; and
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 005178371 for CARREFOUR, registered on August 30, 2007, covering goods and services in Classes 9, 35, and 38.

The disputed domain name <carrefuronlinemarkt.com> was registered on July 25, 2026.

The Respondent is identified in the registration data as Mst Hosne Ara, Israel.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a Turkish-language e-commerce website using the name “CarrefourSA”. CarrefourSA is a supermarket chain in Türkiye operating under a brand licensing agreement with the Complainant. The website also displayed the corporate name “Carrefour Sabancı Ticaret Merkezi A.Ş.” in the copyright notice and included a purchase process requiring users to create an account before proceeding to the entry of payment information.

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.

In particular, the Complainant submits that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CARREFOUR trademark, as it contains a misspelling of the mark, “carrefur”, together with the additional terms “online” and “markt”, which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has used the disputed domain name for a website imitating the Complainant’s CARREFOUR-related business; and
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark and uses the disputed domain name for a website presenting itself as “CarrefourSA”, displaying the corporate name “Carrefour Sabancı Ticaret Merkezi A.Ş.”, and inviting users to create an account and proceed towards payment. The Complainant contends that such use is intended to impersonate the Complainant or its related business and to obtain personal data or payments from Internet users.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that:

- (i) the disputed 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 respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 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 CARREFOUR mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name despite the omission of the letter "o" in "carrefour". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms here, "online" and "markt" 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 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.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark or to register a domain name incorporating a misspelling of that trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The trademark search submitted with the amended Complaint did not identify any CARREFOUR trademark owned by the Respondent.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name was used for a Turkish-language e-commerce website presenting itself as “CarrefourSA” and displaying the corporate name “Carrefour Sabancı Ticaret Merkezi A.Ş.” – using the name of the Complainant’s Turkish affiliate – in the copyright notice. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed 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 Complainant’s trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates a recognizable misspelling of the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark together with the terms “online” and “markt”.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name was used for a Turkish-language e-commerce website presenting itself as “CarrefourSA”, a supermarket chain in Türkiye operating under a brand licensing agreement with the Complainant, and displaying the corporate name “Carrefour Sabancı Ticaret Merkezi A.Ş.”. The website also included a purchase process requiring users to create an account before proceeding to the entry of payment information. These circumstances demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark when registering the disputed domain name and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its associated business.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent used the disputed domain name intentionally to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s CARREFOUR trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. This falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <carrefuronlinemarkt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Martin Švorčík/

Martin Švorčík

Sole Panelist

Date: October 5, 2026