

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. Radistan Gosh
Case No. DCO2025-0020

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Radistan Gosh, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carrefourpagofacil.co> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 27, 2025. On February 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 4, 2025, 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 (Whoisproxy.com / On behalf of carrefourpagofacil.co OWNER) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 10, 2025, 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 March 10, 2025.

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 March 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Anton Polikarpov as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 2025. 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 multinational retail corporation headquartered in Massy, France, and is one of the largest retail groups in the world. Founded in 1959, it operates a wide network of stores in Europe, Asia, and Latin America in several formats including hypermarkets, supermarkets, convenience stores, cash & carry outlets, and online platforms, thus covering a broad spectrum of consumer needs.

In addition to its commercial operations, the Complainant holds an extensive trademark portfolio that reflects its diverse business activities and branding strategy, namely:


- International Trademark No. 191353 for CARREFOUR, registered on March 9, 1956, covering goods Class 3;



- International Trademark No. 331777 for , registered on January 12, 1967, covering goods in Classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34;

- International Trademark No. 351147 for CARREFOUR, registered on October 2, 1968, covering goods in Classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34;

- International Trademark No. 353849 for CARREFOUR, registered on February 28, 1969, covering services in Classes: 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42;

- International Trademark No. 777569 for  كارفور, registered on November 16, 2001, covering goods and services in Classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42 (designating, inter alia, United Arab Emirates).

The core CARREFOUR mark is used across all physical and digital retail operations, all well as in a substantial number of domain names such as <carrefour.com> and <carrefourpagofacil.es>.

The disputed domain name was created on February 13, 2025. At the date of this decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a page of safety warning notice indicating: “the website you are going to open is suspected phishing or malware website”.

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 disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has established rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed 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

The Panel will now evaluate this case in light of the Complaint, the Respondent's lack of response, the Policy, the Rules, and any relevant principles of law deemed applicable, as outlined in accordance with paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

To succeed under the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following elements: (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.

The Respondent, for its part, is expected to provide a detailed reply to the claims made in the Complaint, addressing each allegation and presenting all arguments supporting its right to retain the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

Although afforded the opportunity to do so, the Respondent has chosen not to participate in these proceedings or to contest the claims made by the Complainant.

Considering these circumstances, the Panel rules as follows.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

As noted above, the Complainant has widely registered and used the CARREFOUR mark globally, so this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case (see the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1).

Given the worldwide Internet's nature, the jurisdiction in which the trademark is valid is not considered relevant to the first element of the Policy (see the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.2).

With the Complainant's rights in the trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain name, typically disregarding the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") in which it was registered (in this case, is ".co") is identical or confusingly similar to the CARREFOUR mark (see the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1).

It is well accepted that in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing (see the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.).

Here, the disputed domain name fully includes the CARREFOUR mark at the beginning; the additional terms "pago facil" (Spanish for "easy payment") are descriptive or suggestive words commonly used in commercial contexts, particularly for payment services or financial transactions, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights and the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is deemed to be satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must establish that a respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

All the Complainant's contentions in this matter may be summarized as follows: (i) the Complainant performed searches and found no CARREFOUR mark owned by the Respondent; (ii) the Respondent reproduces the Complainant's earlier registered trademarks in the disputed domain name without any license or authorization from the Complainant; (iii) the Complainant puts forth that the Respondent has not, before the original filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services; (iv) since the adoption and extensive use of its trademarks by the Complainant predates by far the registration of the disputed domain name, the burden is on the Respondent to establish such rights or legitimate interests the Respondent may have or have had in the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances under which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. However, the Respondent failed to describe any reason supporting its side.

The fact that the Respondent did not submit the response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. Nevertheless, it permits the Panel to draw an appropriate inferences and accept all reasonable and supported allegations flowing from the Complaint as true (see *Entertainment Shopping AG v. Nischal Soni, Sonik Technologies*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1437](#)).

As seen from the case file, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name. It has also been shown the absence of any genuine business activity or demonstrable preparations from the Respondent in connection with the disputed domain name. Ultimately, the Respondent is not making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The incorporation of the CARREFOUR mark into the disputed domain name, along with the descriptive term "pago facil" (which translates from Spanish to "easy payment"), appears deliberately crafted to evoke an association with the Complainant's commercial activities, particularly in the area of retail transactions or online payment services. This combination of elements strongly suggests an intention to exploit the Complainant's reputation for commercial gain or to mislead consumers into believing that the disputed domain name is in some way affiliated with, endorsed by, or connected to the Complainant.

In view of these findings, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has not established any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has therefore fulfilled its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 this case, the longstanding and well-established reputation of the Complainant is clear. The CARREFOUR mark has been extensively used in commerce well before the registration of the disputed domain name; some of the Complainant's trademark rights date back to 1955, and the Complainant has operated its principal website through the domain name <carrefour.com> since 1995.

The well-known character of the Complainant's trademarks was also confirmed by multiple panel decisions for years (see *Carrefour v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0155401638 / Binya Rteam*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2895](#); *Carrefour SA v. Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0807](#); *Carrefour SA v. Pedro Castro; Luis Villanueva; Lorenzo Lara; Samuel Naranjo; Alberto Caceres; Antonio Alvarez; Pablo Silva; Enrique Revuelta; Miguel Farias; Alejandro Villalba; Nicolas Ferreyra; Julio Rivas; Marcos Villanueva; Eugenio Cabrera*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4736](#)).

Given the distinctiveness and widespread recognition of the trademarks, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant at the time of registration. The selection of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the CARREFOUR mark in its entirety alongside a descriptive term closely linked to the Complainant's core business, evidences an intent to target the Complainant's brand and its associated goodwill.

As to use of the disputed domain name, resolving to a blank page, it is a generally accepted principle that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark; (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put (see the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3).

The contact details provided by the in the Whois data is clearly false, which, in the Panel's view, together with the above mentioned circumstances, show that all aggravating factors set forth in section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) are present.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a website with potential security risks, according to safety warning notice, indicating that the navigator has blocked the access due to the risk that such page may contain malicious software or phishing schemes aiming at obtaining Internet users' personal data such as bank details and password.

The use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith (see the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

Given all the arguments presented, it is not possible to imagine any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith, so that the third and final element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is met.

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, <carrefourpagofacil.co>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anton Polikarpov /
Anton Polikarpov
Sole Panelist
Date: May 6, 2025