

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA, Atacadão S.A. v. Qingqing Ren
Case No. DCO2025-0053

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Carrefour SA, France, and Atacadão S.A., Brazil, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Qingqing Ren, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <atacado.co> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 8, 2025. On July 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on July 11, 2025, providing the registrant’s additional contact information disclosed by the Registrar. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on the same day.

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 July 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Dietrich Beier as the sole panelist in this matter on August 14, 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 Complainants are Carrefour SA and Atacadão S.A. Atacadão S.A. is part of the Carrefour Group.

Carrefour SA is a worldwide leader in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1968. It had a revenue of 84.9 billion euros in 2023 and operates more than 14,000 stores in more than 40 countries worldwide. It has more than 500,000 employees worldwide and millions of daily unique visitors in its stores.

Atacadão S.A. is a Brazilian chain of wholesale and retail stores established in 1960 and acquired by Carrefour SA in 2007. With over 300 stores and distribution centers in all Brazilian states and more than 70,000 employees, Atacadão S.A. is one of the largest wholesale networks in Brazil. Both companies are hereinafter referred to as the "Complainant".

The Complainant is the proprietor of several trademark registrations for ATACADAO, among them the European Union Trademark No. 012020194 registered on May 24, 2015, in class 35, as well as the Brazil Trademark No. 6785360 registered on October 10, 1978, all being in effect.

In addition, the Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names identical to, or comprising, its trademarks, both within generic or country-code Top-Level domains, among them, for instance, <atacado.com.br> which has been registered since 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 3, 2025.

The disputed domain name redirects to a parked website where the domain name is offered for sale for USD 1,450.

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 trademark enjoys widespread continuous reputation and that the disputed domain name identically adopts the Complainant's ATACADAO marks.

Further, the Respondent was not authorized by the Complainant to make use of his mark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent did not use or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services. Finally, the disputed domain name is likely to mislead Internet users.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Consolidation of the Complainants

As set out in WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)) at section 4.11.1: In assessing whether a complaint file by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific

common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation.

The Panel notes that both Complainants are part of a group of companies and therefore have a common grievance in the dispute. With respect to equity and procedural efficiency, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be inequitable to any party or procedurally inefficient.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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 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 3.0](#), 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. This is in particular the case since the Complainant did not grant any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "atacado" nor that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of related goods or services.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Due to the long existence and intensive use of the Complainant's marks, the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant had not authorized the Respondent to make use of its mark. This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular disputed domain name without the Complainant's authorization.

Furthermore, the second-level domain of the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's domain name <atacado.com.br> and others, which may cause Internet user's confusion.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is offered for sale and finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration likely to be in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(b)(i) of 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 <atacado.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dietrich Beier/

Dietrich Beier

Sole Panelist

Date: August 27, 2025