ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
CARREFOUR SA v. amin fanaee
Case No. D2026-4186

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is amin fanaee, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefourshop.org> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Porkbun LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 17, 2026. On September 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 19, 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 (Whois Privacy / Private by Design, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 21, 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 September 22, 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 September 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on October 26, 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 company operating in the retail sector, including supermarkets and hypermarkets. With a turnover of EUR 94.6 billion in 2024, the Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange (CAC 40). With more than 384,000 employees, the Complainant operates more than 15,000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide. It also offers other services, including financial and travel-related services.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registered trademarks for CARREFOUR, including the following:

- CARREFOUR, International trademark registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, in classes 1 to 34; and

- CARREFOUR, International trademark registration No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, in classes 35 to 42.

The Complainant also operates websites under domain names incorporating its mark, including <carrefour.com>, registered in 1995.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 16, 2026, and resolves to an online retail website displaying the name “Carrefourshop” and offering various products, including stationery and other consumer goods. The website includes product listings, promotional messages, and pages concerning shipping, privacy, and the website operator. The website also provides contact information and an address in California, United States of America, whereas the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar identifies the Respondent in the United Kingdom.

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 is confusingly similar to its CARREFOUR trademark because it reproduces the mark in its entirety, followed by the term “shop”.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. It submits that the Respondent has no corresponding trademark rights, is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, and has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the CARREFOUR mark. The Complainant argues that the content of the associated retail website strongly suggests this website is, in fact, a “fakeshop” whose objective is to collect Internet users’ data, using the Complainant’s trademark goodwill to generate traffic.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It relies on the longstanding registration and reputation of the Complainant’s CARREFOUR mark, the combination of that mark with the term “shop”, and the use of the Disputed Domain Name for a retail website falling directly within the Complainant’s core business. It submits that the Respondent is seeking to attract Internet users for commercial gain by using the prior, well-known trademark of the Complainant in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant also refers to the Respondent’s use of a privacy service.

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 Complainant's CARREFOUR mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name, with the addition of the term "shop". The Panel finds that the addition of this 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.

It is well established that generic Top-Level Domains, here ".org", may be disregarded when considering whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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 Panel notes that the Respondent has not been shown to be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark, and the record does not indicate that the Respondent holds corresponding trademark rights.

Fundamentally, a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term,

UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety and adds the term "shop". In the context of the Complainant's retail activities, the Panel finds that this composition carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

Beyond looking at the disputed domain name and the nature of any additional terms appended to the mark, UDRP panels also assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, such as the content of the website linked to a disputed domain name and the absence of a response, support a fair use or not. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

The website associated with the Disputed Domain Name offers goods for sale, including stationery and other consumer products of a kind also sold in the Complainant's supermarkets. Although the website does not reproduce the appearance of the Complainant's official website, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the name "carrefourshop" in connection with retail offerings reinforces the impression of a commercial connection with the Complainant. In the Panel's view, the circumstances do not demonstrate a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

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. Among these factors demonstrating bad faith registration and use is the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not had the Complainant and its CARREFOUR trademark in mind when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant's trademark registrations predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by several decades, and the CARREFOUR mark has a substantial reputation in the retail sector. Previous UDRP panels confirmed the well-known character of the Complainant's mark. See *Carrefour v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0155401638 / Binya Rteam*, WIPO Case No. D2019-2895; and *Carrefour v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. D2019-2610. Moreover, the Respondent reproduced the mark in its entirety and added the term "shop", which is directly related to the Complainant's retail business.

The website associated with the Disputed Domain Name offers goods for sale, including products similar in nature to goods sold in the Complainant's supermarkets. In the Panel's view, the combination of the Complainant's trademark with the term "shop", together with the use of the Disputed Domain Name for an online retail website including various generic elements raising questions as to its genuine nature, supports the conclusion that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

By failing to respond to the Complaint, the Respondent did not take any initiative to contest the foregoing. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw the conclusions it considers appropriate.

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 <carrefourshop.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/
Flip Jan Claude Petillion
Sole Panelist
Date: November 9, 2026