

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Campofrio Food Group SA v. Jaydon Ramos, Name redacted
Case No. D2025-4623

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Campofrío Food Group SA, Spain, represented by Domgate, France.

The Respondent is Jaydon Ramos, Name redacted,¹ Spain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carnesselectas2000.com> is registered with NETIM SARL (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 7, 2025. On November 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 10, 2025, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 10, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 18, 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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third-party organization when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s organization name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent organization. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 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

The Complainant is a Spanish corporation set up in 1952 and, a leader in processed meat products doing business in Europe and the Americas through different brands.

On 2006 the Complainant took over management of "Carnes Selectas 2000, S.A.U." company located in Burgos (Spain). The Complainant is the owner of CARNESELECTAS CALIDAD DE ORIGEN trademark before Patent and Trademark Spanish Office, registered on April 16, 2009.



The disputed domain name <carnesselectas2000.com> was registered on February 22, 2023 and redirected to a website where the Respondent purported to be Complainant's affiliate company by selling similar products, reproducing Complainant's affiliate company name and, identifying its postal address as if it was that of the Respondent. Upon receiving an abuse form report the Registrar blocked the disputed domain and thus, currently is inactive.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain is confusingly similar to CARNESELECTAS trademark because despite adding the letter "s" or, the number "2000", the requirement is met.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent was operating in the same business area while pretending to be the Complainant. Thus, no rights may arise in favor the Respondent. Further, none of the circumstances described in paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy applies in this case.

The Complainant also asserts that both the company name and address in the RDAP records refers to two different companies not part of this procedure. On one side, the registrant organization is for a company located in Gallur (Zaragoza) and on the other, hand the business address is for a different company located in Ruidellots de la Selva (Girona). Accordingly, the Respondent usurped the identity of a third company and provided false contact details in the RDAP registration.

The Complainant contends that the website to which the disputed domain redirected use the © logo which tantamount to certain Intellectual Property knowledge for the Respondent.

Regarding the third requirement, Respondent's intent was to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark to attract Internet users to its website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

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

There are no exceptional circumstances within paragraph 5(f) of the Rules to prevent the Panel from determining the dispute based upon the Complaint, notwithstanding the failure of the Respondent to file a Response. Under paragraph 14(a) of the Rules in the event of such a "default" the Panel is still required "to proceed with a decision on the complaint", whilst under paragraph 14(b) it "shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate". This dispute resolution procedure is accepted by the domain name registrant as a condition of registration.

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 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 mark is recognizable 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. The Panel notes that CARNESELECTAS is the most prominent part of the mark while CALIDAD DE ORIGEN is a message in small print.

Although the addition of other terms here, letter "s" and figure "2000" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term or figure do 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 the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

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

While the Policy in paragraph 4 (c) takes into consideration the three illustrative examples of Respondent rights, the Complainant has evidenced that none is met in this case.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The fact that “carnes selectas” is a common dictionary phrase which means “selected meats” in English, it does not give automatically rights for the Respondent. Effectively, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name genuinely but targeting and impersonating which indicates Respondent’s intention to mislead Internet users. The printout of Respondent’s website is evidence of bad faith since Complainant’s affiliate company name is fully reproduced as well as other contact business information.

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent meets the circumstances depicted in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. That is to say, the Respondent targeted Complainant’s trademark to intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. This way, the Respondent targeted and disrupted Complainant’s business and trademarks.

Further, the Panel looks at [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 3.1.3: “...the notion of a ‘competitor’ beyond the concept of an ordinary commercial or business competitor to also include the concept of ‘a person who acts in opposition to another’ for some means of commercial gain, direct or otherwise”. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent is disrupting the Complainant’s business as depicted in paragraph 4 b) (iii) of the Policy.

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.

On balance, the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its trademark. As noted above, the Respondent did take use of Complainant's company name and rights inappropriately.

Therefore, a previous knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark seem more than plausible.

In addition, Respondent's illegal activity impersonating the Complainant as well as the introduction of inaccurate data in the registration details for the disputed domain name, would support the conclusion of bad faith registration and use by the Respondent.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has 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 <carnesselectas2000.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025