



**DECISION OF THE THIRD-PARTY DECIDER**  
**CARREFOUR SA / Maxim FILIPPOV**  
**Case no. 444281 / carrefour-kallo.be**

**1. The Parties**

**1.1.1 Complainant: CARREFOUR SA**

Avenue de Paris 93, 91300 Massy, France

*Represented by:*

Emmanuel Gillet – IP Twins

IP Twins, 78 rue de Turbigo, 75003 Paris, France

Hereinafter referred to as the “Complainant”.

**1.1.2 Domain name holder: Maxim FILIPPOV**

Hovseterveien 44C-22, 0768 Oslo, Norway.

*Represented by:*

Hereinafter referred to as the “Respondent”.

**2. Domain name**

Domain name: carrefour-kallo.be

Registered on: 22 June 2026

Hereafter referred to as “the domain name”.

**3. Procedure**

On 17 July 2026, the Complainant's representative requested disclosure of the identity of the holder of the Disputed Domain Name from DNS Belgium (Annex 2-1).

On 20 July 2026, DNS Belgium disclosed the Respondent's contact details and confirmed the language of the registration agreement (Annex 2-2).

The Complaint is dated and signed 23 July 2026. The Complainant requests the transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.



The Respondent did not submit a Response.

On August 28, CEPANI appointed Etienne Wéry as Third-Party Decider.

The proceedings were closed on September 4.

#### **4. Factual Background information**

The Complainant is the company CARREFOUR, which operates in the retail sector. The documents submitted establish the presence of the Carrefour retail network in Belgium, including a store trading as "Carrefour express Kallo" at Beverse Dijk 2, 9120 Beveren-Waas. This store appears on both the French and Dutch versions of the Carrefour store locator (Annex 3-1 and the annexes entitled "Carrefour Kallo FR" and "Carrefour Kallo NL").

The Complainant relies, in particular, on international trademark registrations No. 351147, registered on 2 October 1968, and No. 353849, registered on 28 February 1969, both containing the verbal element CARREFOUR and extending to the Benelux. The extracts identify the Complainant as the owner and indicate expiry dates of 2 October 2028 and 28 February 2029, respectively (Annexes 4-2 and 4-3).

The Complainant also submits extracts relating to international trademark registration No. 191353 and European Union trademark registration No. 005178371 (Annexes 4-1 and 4-4).

#### **5. Position of the parties**

##### **Position of the Complainant**

The Complainant submits that all three cumulative requirements under Article 10(b)(1) of the Terms and Conditions of DNS Belgium (the "Policy") are met.

As to the first requirement, the Complainant argues that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates its CARREFOUR trademark in its entirety. The addition of the geographical term "kallo", referring to a locality in which a Carrefour store operates, reinforces the likelihood of confusion. Internet users are likely to understand the Disputed Domain Name as identifying an official website associated with the Complainant's activities in Kallo.

As to the second requirement, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated with it and has not been authorised or licensed to use its trademark or to register the Disputed Domain Name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known as "Carrefour Kallo" or holds corresponding rights. The Complainant further submits that redirecting users to unrelated adult-oriented websites is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

As to the third requirement, the Complainant relies on the longstanding protection and reputation of its CARREFOUR trademark, the deliberate combination of that trademark with the location of an actual store, and the use of the Disputed Domain Name to redirect users to unrelated adult-



oriented content. It argues that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant, sought to create a false impression of affiliation, and exploited the reputation of its trademark. It also submits that the association with adult content exposes its trademark to reputational harm.

The Complainant considers that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In any event, it submits that bad-faith use is established.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the Disputed Domain Name to it.

### **Position of the Domain name holder**

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

## **6. Discussion and findings**

Pursuant to Article 16.1 of the *CEPANI rules for domain name dispute resolution*, the Third-Party Decider shall rule on domain name disputes with due regard for the Policy and the CEPANI rules for domain name dispute resolution.

Pursuant to Article 10b (1) of the Terms and conditions of domain name registrations under the ".be" domain operated by DNS BE, the Complainant must provide evidence of the following:

- *" the registrant's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark, a trade name, a registered name or a company name, a geographical designation, a name of origin, a designation of source, a personal name or name of a geographical entity in which the complainant has rights; and*
- *the registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and*
- *the registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith."*

Article 6.4 of the Rules provides for a decision on the Complaint where the Respondent does not submit a Response. The Respondent's default does not relieve the Complainant of the burden of establishing the requirements for transfer. The Third-Party Decider may, however, accept reasonable and coherent factual allegations that are uncontested and are not contradicted by the case file, taking into account the supporting evidence.



### **The Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights**

The Complainant has established rights in the CARREFOUR trademarks, including international registrations No. 351147 of 2 October 1968 and No. 353849 of 28 February 1969, which extend to the Benelux (Annexes 4-2 and 4-3).

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the verbal element CARREFOUR of these trademarks in its entirety. That element remains immediately recognisable within "carrefour-kallo". Neither the hyphen nor the technical extension ".be" alters this assessment.

The addition of "kallo" reinforces the likelihood of confusion. The evidence establishes that a Carrefour store operates in that locality. The Disputed Domain Name thus combines the trademark with a geographical indication corresponding to an actual establishment within the Carrefour network.

An Internet user specifically searching for the Carrefour store in Kallo may naturally be led to believe that "carrefour-kallo.be" is the website of that store. Such a search is a concrete and plausible scenario. The combination of the two terms therefore makes the apparent connection with the Complainant more specific and more credible: it suggests that the Disputed Domain Name identifies a particular store within its network.

This assessment is consistent with CEPANI case law holding that the addition of a term to a trademark that remains recognisable in a domain name does not suffice to avoid confusing similarity and may, depending on its meaning, reinforce the apparent connection with the complainant's activities (CEPANI Case No. 444145, disney-store.be, Case No. 444275, mijnazdelta.be, 27 July 2026).

The Third-Party Decider therefore finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

The first requirement is met.

### **The Domain name holder has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name**

It may be difficult for the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant must therefore put forward evidence establishing a prima facie case of such absence. It is then for the Respondent to explain and substantiate any rights or legitimate interests it may have (see, in particular, CEPANI Case No. 44495, geforce.be, 20 May 2020 ; Case No. 444145, disney-store.be, 21 October 2021 ; Case No. 444266, fritriedumiroir.be, 13 March 2026).

Article 10(b)(3) of the Policy provides, in particular, that rights or legitimate interests may be demonstrated by use of the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or demonstrable preparations for such use, by the holder being commonly known by the relevant name, or by legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

In this case, the Complainant states, without being contradicted, that the Respondent is not affiliated with it and has not been authorised to use its trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it.



Nothing in the case file indicates that the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or made demonstrable preparations for such use. Nor is there any indication that the Respondent is commonly known as "Carrefour Kallo" or holds rights in that name.

Finally, the use of the Disputed Domain Name to direct Internet users to adult-oriented content, examined below, does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use in the circumstances of this case.

The fact that "carrefour" is also a dictionary word does not suffice to establish a legitimate interest in these circumstances. The Disputed Domain Name combines that word with the locality of a Carrefour store, while the case file reveals no use corresponding to its ordinary meaning.

The Complainant has thus established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent has not replied to the Complaint and has submitted no evidence capable of establishing any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Third-Party Decider therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The second requirement is met.

## **The Domain name holder's Domain Name has been registered or is being used in bad faith**

### **Registration or Use in Bad Faith**

Article 10(b)(1) of the Policy requires that the domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith. These are alternative grounds: either is sufficient to satisfy the third requirement. Bad faith need not therefore be present both at registration and during use of the domain name (CEPANI Case No. 444266, *friteriedumiroir.be*, 13 March 2026).

Bad faith may be inferred from a combination of consistent circumstances. CEPANI case law takes account, in particular, of knowledge of the complainant's rights, the choice of domain name and its actual use (CEPANI Case No. 444145, *disney-store.be*, 21 October 2021, section 6.3; Case No. 444275, *mijnazdelta.be*, 27 July 2026, section 6.3). The circumstances listed in Article 10(b)(2) of the Policy are not exhaustive.

The registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name are examined separately below.

### **Registration in Bad Faith**

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on 22 June 2026, several decades after the trademarks relied upon by the Complainant. The longstanding nature of these rights, the reputation of the CARREFOUR trademark and the presence of the retail network in Belgium are relevant to assessing the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.



The choice of the Disputed Domain Name is particularly revealing in this respect. The Respondent combined the CARREFOUR trademark with the name of a locality in which a Carrefour store actually operates. That combination thus appears to identify a specific establishment within the Carrefour network.

In these circumstances, the Third-Party Decider considers that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademark when registering the Disputed Domain Name and chose this combination to create an apparent connection with its activities. The case file reveals no independent connection between the Respondent and the name "Carrefour Kallo" that might otherwise reasonably explain that choice.

The use observed approximately one month after registration supports this assessment: the Disputed Domain Name directs Internet users to adult-oriented content, unrelated to the store it evokes. This use is taken into account as an additional indication of the purpose behind the initial choice, together with the composition of the Disputed Domain Name and the other circumstances of the case.

The Respondent has provided no explanation capable of calling into question the conclusions drawn from these consistent indications. The Third-Party Decider finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and a store within its network.

Registration in bad faith is established.

### **Use in Bad Faith**

Independently of the foregoing findings concerning registration, the use of the Disputed Domain Name also constitutes bad faith.

The Complainant explains that Internet users accessing the Disputed Domain Name are automatically directed, through a series of redirects, to an adult dating page.

Annexes 7-1 and 7-2 corroborate this explanation. They show the destination page and, in the latter annex, the navigation information in which the Disputed Domain Name appears. This use is described precisely and supported by evidence. It is not contested by the Respondent and is not contradicted by anything in the case file. The Third-Party Decider accepts it as established.

The Disputed Domain Name thus attracts Internet users through an apparent connection with the Carrefour store in Kallo and then directs them to content entirely unrelated to what they could reasonably expect to find. To that end, it exploits the Complainant's trademark and the correspondence between the geographical indication selected and an actual store within its network.

The fact that the destination page is displayed under a different address does not remove the misleading nature of this use. By the time the Internet user discovers the final destination, the Disputed Domain Name has already served to attract and divert that user.



The decision in *observo.be* likewise found bad-faith use where a domain name was used to redirect Internet users to adult websites operated under different addresses and unrelated to the protected sign (CEPANI Case No. 444218, *observo.be*, 5 November 2024).

The nature of the content to which Internet users are directed reinforces this assessment. The resulting association between a retail brand and sexually suggestive solicitations is liable to harm the reputation of the trademark. It is not necessary, for this purpose, to determine whether the content itself is lawful.

The Third-Party Decider therefore finds that the Disputed Domain Name is being used in bad faith.

The third requirement is met, both on the ground of registration in bad faith and on the ground of use in bad faith.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Third-Party Decider finds that all three requirements under Article 10(b)(1) of the Policy are met.

Consequently, pursuant to Article 10(e) of the *Terms and conditions of domain name registrations under the ".be" domain operated by DNS BE*, the Third-Party Decider hereby rules that the domain name registration for the "**carrefour-kallo.be**" domain name :

is to be transferred to the complainant.

Brussels, 11 September 2026

-----  
Etienne, WERY

The Third-party Decider