

PANEL DECISION

Carrefour SA v. John Halami
Case No. DEU2026-0024

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is John Halami, France.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <spectacles-carrefour.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is Tucows.com Co.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 12, 2026. On June 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 15, 2026, the Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 24, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "ADR Rules") and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 25, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was July 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Alexandre Nappey as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a French company founded in 1959 and a major international retailer. It operates several thousand stores in more than 30 countries, including in a number of Member States of the European Union.

In addition to its retail activities, the Complainant operates an online ticketing business under the name “Carrefour Spectacles”, notably through the website available at the subdomain <spectacles.carrefour.fr>. The Complainant owns, among others, the following trademark registrations:

- French trademark SPECTACLES CARREFOUR No. 97674944, registered on April 23, 1997, in Classes 16 and 41; and
- International trademark CARREFOUR No. 191353, registered on March 9, 1956.

The Complainant also owns and uses numerous domain names incorporating the CARREFOUR trademark, including <carrefour.com>, <carrefour.fr>, and <carrefour.eu>.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 4, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to an error page and was not being actively used. The case record also shows that, on July 21, 2026, the disputed domain name returned a “503 Service Unavailable” response.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to names in respect of which it holds rights recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law. It submits that the disputed domain name reproduces all the verbal elements of its SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademark, merely reversing their order and inserting a hyphen. The disputed domain name also incorporates the CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety. According to the Complainant, the use of the terms “carrefour” and “spectacles” in combination reinforces the likelihood of confusion because it corresponds directly to the Complainant’s ticketing activity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks; the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and the disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In view of the reputation and longstanding registration of the CARREFOUR trademark, the Complainant argues that the Respondent could not have been unaware of its rights. The particular combination of the terms “spectacles” and “carrefour” specifically targets the Complainant’s SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademark and ticketing activity. The Complainant further submits that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case. The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, the Panel shall issue a decision granting the remedy requested where the Complainant proves that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law; and either;
- (ii) the disputed domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interests in the name; or
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision for the Complainant. The Complainant must still establish the requirements of the ADR Rules. The Panel may, however, draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to reply as it considers appropriate.

Given the substantive similarities between the ADR Rules and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel considers it appropriate, where relevant, to refer by analogy to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") and to prior decisions under the UDRP.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

The Complainant has established rights in the CARREFOUR and SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademarks. Those trademark rights constitute rights recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law for the purposes of the ADR Rules.

The disputed domain name reproduces in their entirety the two verbal elements of the Complainant's SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademark. The reversal of the order of those elements and the insertion of a hyphen do not prevent the trademark from remaining readily recognizable. The disputed domain name also incorporates the CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety.

The country-code Top-Level Domain ".eu" is a technical requirement of registration and is disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to names in respect of which the Complainant has rights recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law. The requirement of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules is satisfied.

See also *Carrefour S.A v. JULIA Bambini*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2026-0018](#); and *Carrefour SA v. DARASE Keoma*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2026-0015](#).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph B(11)(e) of the ADR Rules sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances by which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. Although the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, once the Complainant makes out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has stated that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the CARREFOUR or SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademarks. Nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent, whose name is John Halami, has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any corresponding name. Nor is there any evidence of use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the disputed domain name has remained inactive.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name combines the Complainant's well-known CARREFOUR trademark with the term "spectacles", which corresponds precisely to an activity actually carried out by the Complainant under the SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademark and through <spectacles.carrefour.fr>. In the circumstances, the disputed domain name carries a clear risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant has therefore made out a prima facie case, which the Respondent has not rebutted. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interests. The requirement of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules is satisfied.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The requirements of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) and (iii) of the ADR Rules are alternative. Having found that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the Panel is not required to reach a finding on bad faith. Nevertheless, for completeness, the Panel addresses this issue.

The CARREFOUR trademark is highly distinctive and has been registered and used for many decades. The Respondent, who is located in France, registered the disputed domain name in 2026, long after the Complainant acquired its trademark rights. More importantly, the disputed domain name does not merely combine the CARREFOUR trademark with an arbitrary term. It reproduces, in reverse order, the two elements of the Complainant's SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademark and corresponds directly to the Complainant's ticketing activity operated through the domain name <spectacles.carrefour.fr>. The Panel considers that this specific composition cannot reasonably be coincidental and demonstrates that the Respondent had the Complainant and its services in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name has not been actively used. Passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. In assessing passive holding, panels consider the totality of the circumstances, including the distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, the respondent's failure to provide evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or the use of false or inaccurate contact details. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Here, the reputation and distinctiveness of the CARREFOUR trademark, the exact targeting of the SPECTACLES CARREFOUR trademark and the Complainant's ticketing activity, the absence of any rights or legitimate interests, the lack of any plausible good-faith explanation for the choice of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's failure to reply support a finding of bad faith. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <spectacles-carrefour.eu>, be transferred to the Complainant¹.

/Alexandre Nappey/

Alexandre Nappey

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026

¹ (i) The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.

(ii) The Complainant established in France satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517.