



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

**URS DISPUTE NO. 648613C1**

Determination DEFAULT

**I. PARTIES**

Complainant(s): Carrefour SA (France)  
Complainant's authorized representative: IP Twins (France)

Respondent(s): Unknown (domain protected via privacy service) (GB)

**II. THE DOMAIN NAME(S), REGISTRY OPERATOR AND REGISTRAR**

Domain Name: Carrefour1963CrRfY.shop  
Registry Operator: GMO Registry, Inc.  
Registrar: Gname.com Pte. Ltd

**III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Complaint submitted: 6 May 2025  
Lock of the domain name(s): 13 May 2025  
Notice of Complaint: 13 May 2025  
Default Date: 27 May 2025  
Notice of Default: 28 May 2025  
Panel Appointed: 1 June 2025  
Default Determination issued: 4 June 2025

**IV. EXAMINER**

Examiner's Name: Ganna Prokhorova

The Examiner certifies that she has acted independently and impartially and to the best of her 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:**

Complainant is a worldwide leader in retail and a pioneer of the concept of hypermarkets back in 1963. With a turnaround of 80,7 billion euros in 2019, Complainant is listed on the index of the Paris Stock Exchange. 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 is also the registrant of the domain name <carrefour.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

- International trademark "CARREFOUR" No. 351147, registered on October 2, 1968, for the following ICGS classes: 01 to 34;
- International trademark "CARREFOUR" No. 353849, registered on February 28, 1969 for the following ICGS classes: 35 to 42.

The Complainant asserts the following regarding the Respondent:

1. The domain name <Carrefour1963CrRfY.shop> is identical or confusingly similar to a word or mark [URS 1.2.6.1]:

(i) For which the Complainant holds a valid national or regional registration and that is in current use;

2. The Respondent has no legitimate right or interest to the domain name [URS 1.2.6.2];

3. The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith [URS 1.2.6.3]:

d. By using the domain name(s), 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.

### **B. Respondent:**

The identification of the Respondent is hidden.

The Respondent has not filed an official response within the deadline

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

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.



### **C. Findings of fact:**

Despite the Respondent has defaulted, URS Procedure 1.2.6 requires the Complainant to make a prima facie case, proven by clear and convincing evidence, for each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be suspended.

[URS 1.2.6.1] The registered domain name(s) is/are identical or confusingly similar to a word mark:

(i) for which the Complainant holds a valid national or regional registration and that is in current use; or

(ii) that has been validated through court proceedings; or

(iii) that is specifically protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the URS complaint is filed.

[URS 1.2.6.2] Registrant has no legitimate right or interest to the domain name.

[URS 1.2.6.3.] The domain was registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **E. Reasoning:**

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

To satisfy URS 1.2.6.1, a complainant needs to prove its rights in a word mark and the domain name(s) is/are identical or confusingly similar to the word mark.

In the present case, the Examiner finds that the Complainant is a reputed company, especially in France, due to its longstanding presence in the retail industry and its role as a pioneer of the hypermarket concept. Complainant also owns trademark registrations in different jurisdictions all over the world.

The Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the "CARREFOUR" trademark. The Examiner accepts that the Disputed Domain Name includes the Complainant's "CARREFOUR" trademark in its entirety. The additional elements "1963" and "crrfy" in the Disputed Domain Name do not alter the underlying trademark or negate the confusing identity to the "CARREFOUR" trademark. In fact, "1963" corresponds to the year of foundation of the Complainant and further increases the likelihood of association.

In addition, the Examiner also finds that the ".shop" new generic top-level domain, that is used in the Disputed Domain Name ("new gTLD"), does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity under the first element. Furthermore, the use of such new gTLD additionally augments the probability of confusion.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied URS 1.2.6.1 as the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks.

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

To satisfy URS 1.2.6.2, the Complainant must first make a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name, and the burden of proof then shifts to the Respondent to show it does have rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the "CARREFOUR" trademark in the Disputed Domain Name or in the content of the respective website. There is no legal or business relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Respondent has no prior rights such as trademarks or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name as it was registered after the Complainant had registered the "CARREFOUR" trademark. Thus, the Respondent's use is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, and is not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Examiner finds that the Complainant has met its burden and established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, and the Respondent has not rebutted the assertion.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied URS 1.2.6.2 as the Respondent has no legitimate rights or interest to the Disputed Domain Name.

## **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 prove both the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name are in bad faith.

It is clear that the Respondent's purpose is to capitalize on the reputation of the Complainant's "CARREFOUR" trademark by diverting Internet users seeking the Complainant's services to their website for financial gain, intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of their website and/or the goods or services offered or promoted through said website.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied URS 1.2.6.3 as the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name and is using it in bad faith.

## **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 Name: Carrefour1963CrRfY.shop

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: Ganna

Surname: Prokhorova

Date: 3 June 2025