ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Carrefour SA v. Basile Shady
Case No. D2026-4353

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Basile Shady, France.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <activation-carrefourpass.com> and <support-carrefouractionperso.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 28, 2026. On September 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 30, 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 / Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 October 1, 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 October 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on October 29, 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. The Complainant states that it was founded in 1959, that it pioneered the concept of hypermarkets in 1963, that it employs more than 384,000 people worldwide, and that it is listed on Euronext Paris. The Complainant also states that it provides financial services under its CARREFOUR PASS and CARREFOUR PAY trademarks.

The Complainant owns trademarks consisting of or comprising CARREFOUR, including the following:

- International Trademark CARREFOUR (figurative) registration No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, in international classes 1 to 34;

- International Trademark CARREFOUR (figurative) registration No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969, in international classes 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42; and

- French Trademark CARREFOUR PASS registration No. 99780481, filed on March 12, 1999, registered on April 16, 1999, in international class 36.

The Complainant also owns domain names comprising its CARREFOUR trademark, including the domain name <carrefour.com>, registered on October 25, 1995, and <carrefour.fr>, registered on June 23, 2005.

The disputed domain names were registered on September 7 and 8, 2026, as follows:

Disputed domain name	Registration date	Use at the time of filing the Complaint
<activation-carrefourpass.com>	September 7, 2026	Inactive website
<support-carrefouractionperso.com>	September 8, 2026	Inactive website

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, neither of the disputed domain names resolved to an active website, and no Mail Exchange ("MX") records were configured for either of them.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names still do not resolve to active websites.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names reproduce its CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety, and that the disputed domain name <activation-carrefourpass.com> also reproduces its CARREFOUR PASS trademark in its entirety; that the addition of the terms "activation", "support", and "actionperso" does not prevent its trademarks from being recognizable; and that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is to be disregarded.

The Complainant further contends that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks; that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names; that there is no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services or of a legitimate noncommercial or fair use; and that

the composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, in particular with the financial services it offers under the CARREFOUR PASS trademark.

Finally, the Complainant contends that its CARREFOUR trademark is well-known and has been recognized as such in prior UDRP decisions; that the Respondent, whose disclosed contact details place it in France, could not have been unaware of it; that the composition of the disputed domain names, which combine its trademarks with terms suggestive of customer-facing services, shows a deliberate targeting; that the disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar on consecutive days, using the same privacy service and the same name servers; that the postal address disclosed by the Registrar is incomplete; and that the passive holding of the disputed domain names, which do not resolve to active websites and have no MX records, constitutes use in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names.

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 the CARREFOUR and CARREFOUR PASS trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The textual element "carrefour" of the Complainant's figurative international trademark is reproduced in its entirety within both disputed domain names, and the CARREFOUR PASS trademark is reproduced in its entirety within the disputed domain name <activation-carrefourpass.com>. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.10.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "activation" in the first disputed domain name, and "support" and "actionperso" in the second, together with hyphens) 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 names and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the marks are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register the disputed domain names or use the CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS trademarks. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor that the Respondent has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of them.

Moreover, the disputed domain names combine the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark, or its CARREFOUR PASS trademark, with the terms "activation", "support", and "actionperso", which may refer to customer-facing services of the Complainant. Such composition carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute fair use. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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.

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.

The disputed domain names were registered in September 2026, several decades after the registration of the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademarks. The disputed domain name <activation-carrefourpass.com> reproduces the CARREFOUR PASS trademark, under which the Complainant states that it provides financial services, preceded by the term "activation", and the disputed domain name <support-carrefouractionperso.com> reproduces the CARREFOUR trademark together with the terms "support" and "actionperso". In the Panel's view, the composition of the disputed domain names indicates that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademarks and likely registered the disputed domain names with the intention to target them.

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 (i) the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's CARREFOUR trademark, at least in France; (ii) the composition of the disputed domain names, which combine the Complainant's CARREFOUR or CARREFOUR PASS trademark with terms that may refer to customer-facing services; (iii) the failure of the

Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; and (iv) the postal address disclosed by the Registrar for the Respondent, which consists only of the number "36", without any street name. The Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names 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 names <activation-carrefourpass.com> and <support- carrefouractionperso.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elise Dufour/
Elise Dufour
Sole Panelist
Date: November 12, 2026