ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Carrefour SA v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-4193

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Name Redacted.[1]

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <group-carrefovr.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (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 21, 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 (Unknown) 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 21, 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").

[1] The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 13, 2026. On September 29 and October 1, 2026, the Center received communications from a third party.

The Center appointed Marie-Emmanuelle Haas as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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 one of the leaders in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1968. With a total revenue of approximately EUR 87.2 billion in 2024, the Complainant is listed in the CAC 40 index of the Paris Stock Exchange.

The Complainant operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries.

The Complainant owns several hundred trademark rights worldwide composed with CARREFOUR.

In particular, the Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks, registered well before the registration of the disputed domain name:

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

- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, duly renewed, and designating services in classes 35 to 42;

- European Union Trade Mark CARREFOUR No. 005178371, registered on August 30, 2007, duly renewed, and designating goods and services in classes 9, 35 and 38.

The Complainant is the registrant of the domain names <carrefour.com> and <carrefour.fr>.

The disputed domain name <group-carrefovr.com> was registered on September 9, 2026, and does not resolve to any website, but to a page mentioning: "This site can't be reached. Check if there is a typo in www.group-carrefovr.com".

The registrant is identified with a fanciful postal address, since the postal code and city do not correspond.

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 its earlier trademarks are well-known.

The Complainant asserts that its fame and notoriety is evidenced on the Internet, by the fact that its Facebook page is currently "liked" by more than 12 million Internet users.

i. Confusing similarity

The disputed domain name <group-carrefovr.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier well-known CARREFOUR trademark, which is recognizable in this disputed domain name.

The letter "u" is replaced by the letter "v". These letters have a similar visual appearance and can be easily mistaken for one another.

The addition of the generic term "group" does not avoid the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Therefore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier CARREFOUR trademark.

The Complainant contends that the first condition under the Policy should be deemed satisfied.

ii. Absence of rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use its CARREFOUR trademark in any manner, including in domain names. There is no affiliation or business relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that would justify the Respondent's use of the Complainant's well-known trademark.

The searches for CARREFOUR trademarks in the name of the Respondent did not reveal any trademark registrations.

The Respondent has not made any attempt to make legitimate use of the disputed domain name.

In fact, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website, but instead to an "error page".

The disputed domain name is inherently likely to mislead Internet users and its specific composition carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant which cannot constitute fair use. A simple search of "group-carrefovr" on Google in France, where the Respondent is allegedly resident, shows that all results refer to the Complainant.

The adoption and extensive use of its trademarks by the Complainant predates by far the registration of the domain name, the burden is on the Respondent to establish the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests the Respondent may have or have had in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that it has made a prima facie case that the disputed domain name was registered without right or legitimate interest.

The Complainant contends that the second condition under the Policy should be deemed satisfied.

iii. Bad faith registration and use

The CARREFOUR trademark is highly distinctive and well-known, particularly in the field of retail and consumer goods.

Given the global renown of the CARREFOUR trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's prior CARREFOUR trademark.

The passive holding of the disputed domain name may satisfy the requirements of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy:

- The CARREFOUR trademark significantly predates the disputed domain name, it is well-known internationally and inherently distinctive.

- The Complainant cannot think of any future use that may be done by the Respondent in good faith.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

- The Respondent, in breach of the registration agreement, attempted to conceal its true identity, using fanciful and wrong contact details.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, on September 29 and October 1, 2026, the Center received communications from a third party indicating that the Respondent had used false registrant information impersonating the third party when registering the disputed domain name, and that the third party had no connection to the disputed domain name.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The letter "u" has been replaced by the letter "v", which is visually very similar. This constitutes an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and is characteristic of a typosquatting practice, intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. Accordingly, this misspelling does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as commented in the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms, here "group", 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

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, the respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating any of the following:

(i) before any notice to it of the dispute, the respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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.

The Respondent was not authorized to use or register the disputed domain name, and neither made any bona fide use of the disputed domain name (or demonstrable plans for such use), nor any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Moreover, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Providing an address which is clearly false is indeed a breach of the registration agreement, and impersonating a third party can never confer rights or legitimate interests.

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 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.

This list of non-exhaustive circumstances is as follows:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered, or the respondent has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) the respondent has registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the 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) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's well-known CARREFOUR trademark, when it decided to register the disputed domain name incorporating an obvious typo of the CARREFOUR trademark.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the clearly false postal address provided in the WhoIs and purported impersonation of a third party, the lack of response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <group-carrefovr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marie-Emmanuelle Haas/
Marie-Emmanuelle Haas
Sole Panelist
Date: October 30, 2026