



**URS | DETERMINATION**  
(URS Procedure 9, URS Rules 13)

**URS DISPUTE NO. 2679F794**

Determination DEFAULT

**I. PARTIES**

Complainant: Carrefour AS (France)

Complainant's authorized representative: IP Twins (France)

Respondents: Deniz Ifadesiz (Türkiye), selehattin ozkan (Türkiye), Ahmet Mahsuni (Türkiye)

**II. THE DOMAIN NAME, REGISTRY OPERATOR AND REGISTRAR**

Domain Names: careffoursa.store, carrefaursa.online, carrefaursa.site, carrefaursa.store, careffoursa.online, careffoursa.site, careffoursa.space, careffoursa.online, careffoursa.store

Registry Operator: CentralNic Registry

Registrar: Namecheap

**III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Complaint submitted: 13 October 2025

Lock of the domain name: 17 October 2025

Notice of Complaint: 28 October 2025

Default Date: 11 November 2025

Notice of Default: 12 November 2025

Panel Appointed: 15 November 2025

Default Determination issued: 17 November 2025

**IV. EXAMINER**

Examiner's Name: Rodolfo C. Rivas

The Examiner certifies that he has acted independently and impartially and to the best of his knowledge has no known conflict in serving as the Examiner in this administrative proceeding.

**V. RELIEF SOUGHT**

The Complainant requests that the domain name be suspended for the balance of the registration period.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response.

**VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Clear and convincing evidence.

## VII. DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS

**A. Complainant:** The Complainant owns International trademark CARREFOUR No. 351147, registered on 2 October 1968, duly renewed, and designating goods in international classes 01 to 34; and International trademark CARREFOUR No. 353849, registered on 28 February 1969, duly renewed and designating services in international classes 35 to 42.

The disputed domain names were registered in order to prevent the trademark holder or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct.

The disputed domain names were registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor.

By using the disputed domain names, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's web site or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's web site or location.

Consolidation Request: the Complainant submits that the disputed domains are under common control as evidenced by numerous factors:

- The disputed domain names were registered only days apart with the same registrar
- The disputed domain names are typosquatting cases of the CARREFOUR mark plus the "SA" element
- The disputed domain names are registered under 3 unique TLDs
- All Registrants are located in Turkey, Street No. 31

Therefore, the Complainant submits that a consolidated Complaint is justified.

The Complainant is a world leader in retail. The Complainant operates more than 12.000 stores in more than 30 countries worldwide, with more than 321.000 employees worldwide, 11 million daily checkouts in its stores and 1.3 million daily unique visitors in its online stores.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark rights worldwide in "CARREFOUR", used widely in particular the Complainant's official website <carrefour.com>. The Complainant's rights largely predate the registration of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domains imitate the "CARREFOUR" trademark with minor differences "careffour", "carrefaur" and "carreffour", together with the element "sa" which relates to the company form "société anonyme" in French, which is the company form of the Complainant.

Furthermore, the term "carrefour" in relation to retail goods and services is arbitrary. Respondent cannot claim that the domains have been registered for their dictionary meaning. Arbitrary and fanciful marks are among the strongest varieties of marks and, consequently, are generally given strong protection against infringement.

The disputed domain names are not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. They all direct to error pages. The Respondent is not known, as an individual or an organization, by the domain and holds no trademark in "CARREFOUR". The Complainant has



not authorized the Respondent to use the “CARREFOUR” trademark in the disputed domain names, and submits that Complainant made a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Evidence on record clearly shows that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant when registering the domain names. As the disputed domain names all imitate Complainants' trademark, it is clear that a likelihood of confusion is presumed, and such confusion will inevitably result in the diversion of Internet traffic from Complainant's site to the Respondent's website.

By using the disputed domain names, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's web sites or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's web site or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's web site or location. The Respondent engaged in a pattern of behavior, registering several domain names imitating the Complainant's trademarks, preventing the Complainant from reflecting its marks in the disputed domain names.

The sole registration of a well-known trademark in the disputed domain names is an indication of Respondent's bad faith.

The Complainant submits that it has made a prima facie case, the three elements of URS Procedure 1.2.6 are satisfied.

#### **B. Respondent:**

The Respondent has failed to submit a formal response within the required period of time.

#### **C. Procedural findings:**

Before moving forward with the matter, the Examiner must address a preliminary procedural matter. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputed domain names. Although the URS Procedure does not expressly address consolidation, Examiners regularly look to the WIPO Overview 3.0 for guidance. Under section 4.11, consolidation is appropriate where there is prima facie evidence of common control and where it is fair and efficient to do so.

Here, the disputed domain names display clear indicators of common control: a) they were registered only days apart with the same registrar; b) they all consist of seemingly typosquatted variants of the “CARREFOUR” mark plus the element “SA”; c) they follow the same naming pattern across three different TLDs; and d) all Registrants list an address in Turkey, Street No. 31.

These facts collectively support a strong inference of a single underlying registrant and Respondent. Consolidation would therefore be fair, procedurally efficient, and consistent with the persuasive principles reflected in the WIPO Overview 3.0. The Examiner therefore allows the Complaint to proceed on a consolidated basis.

Moving on, and having reviewed the communications records, the Examiner finds that MFSD has discharged its responsibility under the URS Procedure paragraphs 3 and 4 and URS Rules paragraph 4.

In accordance with URS Rules Paragraph 9(d), in absence of a Response, the language of the Determination shall be English.

#### **D. Findings of fact:**

The registration date for the disputed domain names is as follows:

<b>Domain Name</b>	<b>Registration Date</b>	<b>Registrar</b>
careffoursa.online	2025-07-10	NAMECHEAP INC
careffoursa.store	2025-07-10	NAMECHEAP INC
carrefaursa.online	2025-07-07	NAMECHEAP INC
carrefaursa.site	2025-07-07	NAMECHEAP INC
carrefaursa.store	2025-07-07	NAMECHEAP INC
carreffoursa.online	2025-07-09	NAMECHEAP INC
carreffoursa.site	2025-07-08	NAMECHEAP INC
carreffoursa.space	2025-07-09	NAMECHEAP INC
carreffoursa.store	2025-07-08	NAMECHEAP INC

Despite the Respondent has defaulted, the Examiner is still required to review the case on the merits of the claim under URS 6.3.

#### **E. Reasoning:**

##### **1. The domain name(s) is(are) identical or confusingly similar to a word mark**

The Complainant has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that each of the disputed domain names— <careffoursa.online>, <careffoursa.store>, <carrefaursa.online>, <carrefaursa.site>, <carrefaursa.store>, <carreffoursa.online>, <carreffoursa.site>, <carreffoursa.space>, and <carreffoursa.store>—are identical or confusingly similar to a valid trademark in which the Complainant holds rights.

The Complainant has demonstrated longstanding, International trademark rights in the mark “CARREFOUR”, with rights that clearly predate the registration of all disputed domain names. Each of the disputed domain names incorporates a misspelled version of the “CARREFOUR” mark—such as “careffour,” “carrefaur,” and “carreffour”—combined with the element “sa”, which appears to correspond to the Complainant’s corporate form (“société anonyme”) in the French language. These minor deviations do not materially alter the dominant portion of the mark and appear to be characteristic of the common practice known as typosquatting, which is likely intended to capitalize on Internet user confusion.

The addition of “sa” does not distinguish the disputed domain names in any meaningful way; instead, it reinforces the impression of an association with the Complainant. The overall appearance, sound, and commercial impression of the disputed domain names remain confusingly similar to the Complainant’s “CARREFOUR” mark.



Accordingly, the Examiner finds that the Complainant has satisfied URS §1.2.6.1 with clear and convincing evidence.

## **2. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to the domain name(s)**

To satisfy URS 1.2.6.2, the Complainant must first establish a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Once such a case is made, the burden shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate that it does possess rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has established, by clear and convincing evidence, that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The record shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by any of the disputed domain names and holds no trademark or other rights in the mark “CARREFOUR” or any variation of it. The Complainant confirms it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its “CARREFOUR” mark in any manner, including in a domain name.

Moreover, none of the disputed domain names—<careffoursa.online>, <careffoursa.store>, <carrefaursa.online>, <carrefaursa.site>, <carrefaursa.store>, <carreffoursa.online>, <carreffoursa.site>, <carreffoursa.space>, and <carreffoursa.store>—are used in connection with any *bona fide* offering of goods or services. Each resolves only to an error page, and without any explanation to the contrary, it does not constitute legitimate use under the URS. The Respondent has provided no evidence of any preparations to use the disputed domain names for a genuine purpose, nor there is any evidence on record or circumstance that would suggest rights or legitimate interests.

All of the above, in conjunction with the inherently distinctive and arbitrary nature of the “CARREFOUR” mark in relation to retail services, there is no plausible legitimate reason for the Respondent to register misspelling variants of that mark combined with the element “sa”. In the absence of any rebuttal from the Respondent, the Complainant’s *prima facie* case remains un rebutted.

Accordingly, the Examiner finds that the Complainant has satisfied the second element of URS §1.2.6.2 by clear and convincing evidence.

## **3. The domain name(s) was(were) registered and is(are) being used in bad faith**

To satisfy URS 1.2.6.3, the Complainant must demonstrate that both the registration and use of the disputed domain names was carried out in bad faith.

The Complainant has demonstrated, by clear and convincing evidence, that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The evidence shows that the Respondent registered multiple domain names— <careffoursa.online>, <careffoursa.store>, <carrefaursa.online>, <carrefaursa.site>, <carrefaursa.store>, <carreffoursa.online>, <carreffoursa.site>, <carreffoursa.space>, and <carreffoursa.store>—each incorporating deliberate misspellings of the Complainant’s “CARREFOUR” trademark. The consistent pattern of typosquatting across several TLDs demonstrates that the Respondent was clearly

aware of the Complainant and likely intentionally targeted its mark, without any explanation to the contrary.

The combination of these misspellings with the element “sa”, corresponding to the Complainant’s corporate form, further reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent sought to create a false association with the Complainant. Registering multiple such variants constitutes a pattern of conduct designed to interfere with the Complainant’s ability to reflect its trademark in the domain name system.

While the disputed domain names currently resolve to error pages, this does not negate bad faith. Passive holding of domain names that imitate a distinctive mark—without any legitimate explanation—supports an inference of opportunistic bad-faith registration. Given the strength and arbitrariness of the “CARREFOUR” mark in the retail sector, there is no plausible good-faith reason for the Respondent’s registrations.

Therefore, the Examiner finds that the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. This satisfies the bad-faith requirements of URS §1.2.6.3.

Accordingly, the Complainant has met its burden on the third element by clear and convincing evidence.

#### **4. Abusive Complaint**

The Examiner finds that the Complaint was neither abusive nor contained material falsehoods.

### **VIII. DETERMINATION**

#### **A. Demonstration of URS elements**

Demonstrated

#### **B. Complaint and remedy**

Complaint: Accepts

Domain Names: careffoursa.store, carrefaursa.online, carrefaursa.site, carrefaursa.store, careffoursa.online, careffoursa.site, careffoursa.space, careffoursa.online, careffoursa.store

Suspends for the balance of the registration period

#### **C. Abuse of proceedings**

Finding of abuse of proceedings: Not finds

#### **D. Publication**

Publication: Publish the Determination



**SIGNATURE**

Name: Rodolfo C.

Surname: Rivas

Date: 17 November 2025