

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Goya Foods, Inc. and Sazon, Inc. v. Zaddy of Work
Case No. D2025-4423

1. The Parties

Complainants are Goya Foods, Inc. (“Goya Foods”), United States of America (“United States”), and Sazon, Inc., (“Sazon”), United States, represented by Mayer Brown Hong Kong LLP, China.

Respondent is Zaddy of Work, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sazonfoods.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 28, 2025. That same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. Also on October 28, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown/ Privacy User #a2f14aec, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainants on October 29, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainants filed an amended Complaint on November 3, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 25, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on November 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Harrie R. Samaras as the sole panelist in this matter on December 8, 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.

4. Factual Background

Goya Foods was founded in the United States in 1936. It is one of the premier sources for authentic Latino cuisine, offering over 2,500 products. Goya Foods has achieved annual sales of more than USD one billion and cultivated a strong presence in both Hispanic and mainstream markets. Sazon is related to Goya Foods through common ownership. While Sazon was incorporated in 2002, its predecessor was founded in 1973. Sazon develops, manufactures, and markets seasoning and bouillon products that Goya Foods distributes internationally.

Goya Foods owns multiple trademark registrations comprising the term SAZON including: United States Trademark Registration Nos. 1,621,463 (for SAZON GOYA, registered on November 6, 1990 for seasonings) (the “SAZON GOYA Mark”) and 1,997,592 (for SAZON IT!, registered on August 27, 1996 for spices) (collectively, the “Combined Marks”). “SAZON” is the initial portion of both Combined Marks.

The Domain Name was registered on October 19, 2024.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a website (the “Website”) that featured the SAZON GOYA Mark at the top together with “SazonInc,” which is the name of Complainant Sazon, Inc. The use of the Sazon name was also carried through on the Website in the copyright notice: “© Sazon Inc. All Rights Reserved. Designed by Sazon Inc”.

At the time of the Decision, the Website features the SAZON GOYA Mark at the top of almost all of the pages on the Website. There is only one page on which the SAZON GOYA Mark is not prominently featured, however, at the top of that page “SazonInc,” which is the name of Complainant Sazon, Inc., is featured. Also, under the area “About Us” on the Website, Respondent reflects facts about Complainant Sazon (e.g., “Saxon Inc., located in Doral, Florida, was founded in 2002”). The use of Complainant Sazon’s name is also similarly carried through on the Website in the copyright notice: “© Sazon Inc. All Rights Reserved. Designed by Sazon Inc”.

Also, prominently displayed on each page of the Website is a large color photograph showing spices, which are some of the products that Goya Foods sells on the website “www.goya.com” and they are Sazon’s specialty area. The Website suggests that it has similar services to Goya Foods website (e.g., sales of spices and seasonings, recipes using spices, a newsletter). A notable aspect of the Website is that although it advertises for sale various spices with a general price accorded to each spice, one cannot find out anything about the spice, understand what amount the price relates to, or add the spice to a shopping cart to actually buy the spice. That is, there are no operational links for this information or activity. Similarly, for the various services advertised on the Website (e.g., recipe development, cooking workshops, custom spice blends) there are no operational links. When you click on the box advertising each, the box changes color but, otherwise, it is not connected to any webpage.

Respondent is also using the Domain Name as follows:

1. Using the email address “[...]@sazonfoods.com”, which includes the Domain Name, Respondent contacted accounting firms who do payroll processing by passing itself off as Sazon’s “manager of Human Resource[s]” (sic). In the signature line of some of the emails, Respondent used the actual address in Doral, Florida, United States, where Sazon is located. The email disclosed highly confidential and sensitive information that Respondent somehow obtained about the owner and president of Sazon including his social security number.

2. Also using the above email address, Respondent sent emails attaching at least 20 forged completed and executed direct deposit authorization forms representing Sazon employees to the accounting firms for payroll processing. Respondent affixed a logo similar to Complainant's stylized SAZON GOYA Mark on the direct deposit authorization forms and Sazon's actual address in Doral, Florida.

To prevent further fraudulent activity, Complainants filed a police report with the Police Department of the City of Doral, Florida, where Sazon is located.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. Notably, Complainants contend that Sazon and its predecessor company have, since 1973, prominently used the SAZON GOYA Mark in connection with their business and products. Complainants allege they have expended significant time and effort promoting that mark and the products provided in connection with it by marketing and advertising in stores, in trade press and other print media, in TV commercials and on the Internet. The Domain Name incorporates the first half of the SAZON GOYA Mark and adds the descriptive suffix "foods" which does nothing to change the overall commercial impression. Not only does this inclusion fail to mitigate confusion, but it also serves to enhance and contribute to consumer confusion, as the SAZON GOYA Mark is a widely recognized mark. This confusing similarity issue is exacerbated by the fact that Respondent makes a number of the bad faith references to Complainants on Respondent's Website and, more recently, in emails falsely claiming to be from Sazon's human resources department (see conduct described above).

Respondent registered the Domain Name on October 19, 2024, many years after the SAZON GOYA Mark was first used and the Combined Marks were registered. Complainants have not consented or otherwise authorized Respondent to use or register the SAZON GOYA Mark and have never had any dealings with Respondent that could give rise to such rights. Respondent has made no bona fide offerings of its own goods and services in connection with the Domain Name and the Website does not provide for product sales even though it purports to be a retail site. The Domain Name diverts and misdirects Internet users from Complainant's website and then, by operating a website that does not function, Respondent tarnishes the reputation of Complainants. Respondent has also been using the Domain Name to unfairly take advantage of the confusing similarity between the SAZON GOYA mark and the Domain Name to trade on Complainants' goodwill and reputation, which cannot amount to any legitimate interest. Furthermore, Respondent deliberately chose a domain name that is essentially identical to the SAZON GOYA Mark to impersonate Complainants and defraud consumers by virtue of confusing similarity.

Respondent's lack of legitimate rights or interests in the Domain Name is evidence of bad faith. Also, as described above, Respondent is using the Domain Name in bad faith to commit fraud by impersonating Sazon in emails and on direct deposit authorization forms.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

Complainant has 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 Panel finds the dominant element of the Combined Marks, "SAZON", is recognizable within the Domain Name, despite the addition of the term "foods". Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Combined Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While panels usually disregard the content of the website associated with the domain name when assessing confusing similarity under the first element, the Panel finds that the Website as described in detail above, confirms that Respondent through the Domain Name is seeking to target the Combined Marks. The Panel thus concludes that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Combined Marks.

Although the addition of other terms here, "foods" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the 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 the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainants have established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainants' prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for the illegal activity described above, claimed as: fraud and impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, it is undisputed that Respondent registered the Domain Name many years after the Combined Marks were registered and used. The Website as described above demonstrates that Respondent was fully aware of, and sought to target, Complainants, the products they sell, and their rights in the SAZON GOYA mark (used prominently on the Website) when registering the Domain Name. Thus, on that basis alone, the Panel finds that Respondent registered the Domain Name in bad faith. Moreover, using the Domain Name in conjunction with its fraudulent activities as described above (passing itself off as Sazon) with payroll agencies is clear evidence that Respondent registered and uses the Domain Name in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity described above, claimed as fraud and impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <sazonfoods.com> be transferred to Complainants.

/Harrie R. Samaras/

Harrie R. Samaras

Sole Panelist

Date: December 19, 2025