

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rivasam Intercontinental S.A., Jorge S.L. v. Williams Banks
Case No. D2025-4307

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Rivasam Intercontinental S.A. ("first Complainant"), Spain, and Jorge S.L. ("second Complainant"), Spain, represented by Integra, Spain.

The Respondent is Williams Banks, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rivasam-sa.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 21, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on October 22, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on October 23, 2025.

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 October 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Martin Michaus Romero as the sole panelist in this matter on November 26, 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.

After the Panel was appointed, the Respondent sent several email communications to the Center on November 29 and December 4, 2025.

4. Factual Background

The first Complainant is part of the internationally renowned Spanish meat group Grupo Jorge. Its domain name (<rivasam.com>), is redirected to the main website of the group at “www.jorgesl.com”, which lists the companies within this group (see: “www.jorgesl.com/es/nuestras-empresas”).

Grupo Jorge has more than 100 years of history. Today it is one of the largest pork exporters in Europe. In 2024, it reached a turnover of almost EUR 2 billion and exported its products to more than 100 countries across five continents. As part of the Grupo Jorge group, the Complainants have been continuously targeted since the end of 2022 by the same owners, who have been creating and copying fraudulent web pages in which they pretend to be some of the companies of Grupo Jorge (The Pink Pig SA, Fortune Pig SL, Le Porc Gourmet SL, and the second Complainant among others). This situation has affected several of the companies that make up Grupo Jorge. By way of example, the Complainants cite several WIPO decisions involving different domain names that were cancelled in favor of the complainants, such as *Fortune Pig SL, Jorge SL v. Panarchdel LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4907](#), *Jorge SL v. JORGE SL, JORGE SL*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-5330](#), and *LE PORC GOURMET, SA / JORGE PORK MEAT, SL v. Mathew Lennings*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1631](#).

The second Complainant is the owner of the European Union trademark No. 005325139 for RIVASAM, and in force in classes 29, 35, 39, and 40, registered on August 14, 2007.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 23, 2025, and resolves to a website displaying pay-per-click (“PPC”) links.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a cancellation of the disputed domain name.

The Complainants contend that:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their trademark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

They have not authorized or granted any license to the Respondent to use their trademark as part of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has registered and is using the disputed name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions in a formal response. However, the Respondent sent several emails to the Center acknowledging receipt of the case-related communications and inquiring about next steps in the proceeding and the timing of the Decision.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark 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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "-sa" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

B. 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 with the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainants. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Respondent has neither used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor for a legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose. On the contrary, the disputed domain name resolves to a typical PPC website showing a variety of hyperlinks to third-party websites. These links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainants' mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel notes that:

- A) The Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainants and their activities.
- B) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the RIVASAM trademark.
- C) the Complainants' RIVASAM trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to a typical PPC website. The Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademark in connection with such PPC links, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' mark as to the source, sponsorship, or endorsement of the website. Such conduct constitutes evidence of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <rivasam-sa.com> be cancelled.

/Martin Michaus Romero/

Martin Michaus Romero

Sole Panelist

Date: December 10, 2025