

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LE PORC GOURMET, SA, JORGE PORK MEAT, SL v. Jose Carrera Buergo
Case No. D2025-4724

1. The Parties

The Complainants are LE PORC GOURMET, SA, and JORGE PORK MEAT, SL, Spain, represented by Integra, Spain.

The Respondent is Jose Carrera Buergo, Spain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <leporcgourmets.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 14, 2025. On November 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 18, 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, Domain Protection Services, Inc.") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on November 18, 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 the same day.

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 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 11, 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 Complainants, LE PORC GOURMET, SA (the “first Complainant”) and, JORGE PORK MEAT, SL (the “second Complainant”) are part of the internationally renowned Spanish meat group known as Grupo Jorge.

The second Complainant holds LE PORC GOURMET GRUPO JORGE trademark before the European Union Intellectual Property Office with registration number 018021515 registered on July 20, 2019.

The first Complainant holds <leporcgourmet.es> domain name, which was registered on March 9, 2007, and redirects to the main website of the Grupo Jorge at “www.jorgesl.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 14, 2025 and redirects to a website that purports to be the Complainant by reproducing its trademark, stating in the Privacy Policy to be the first Complainant and, operating in the same field of business as the Complainant and identifying the Complainant’s postal address as if it was that of the Respondent. The Respondent’s website displays no disclaimer.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, the Complainants assert that by the end of 2022 GRUPO JORGE has been attacked by the same individual or group of individuals, creating and copying fraudulent web pages in which they pretend to be part of GRUPO JORGE.

The Complainants submit that the Respondent or the final owner of the disputed domain name is the same as the previous cases involving GRUPO JORGE. For such, the Complainant provides UDRP decisions (*LE PORC GOURMET, SA and JORGE PORK MEAT, SL v. Domain Privacy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2385](#), *LE PORC GOURMET, SA / JORGE PORK MEAT, SL v. Mathew Lennings*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1631](#) or *LE PORC GOURMET, SA, JORGE PORK MEAT, SL v. Leonie Dreher*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4421](#)) and cancellations decisions ordered by the Spanish Authority in charge of the “.es” country code Top-Level Domain in connection to several of the Complainants’ trademarks. In this regard, the Complainants highlight that the same disputed domain name at issue in this proceeding has already been cancelled by *LE PORC GOURMET, SA and JORGE PORK MEAT, SL v. Domain Privacy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2385](#).

Regarding the first requirement, the Complainants allege that the disputed domain name fully reproduces its trademark.

Further, the Complainants contend that the Respondent has no authorization to use its trademarks, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name and, neither is the Respondent making any legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use of it. On the contrary, the Respondent appears to have registered the disputed domain name only to take unfair advantage of the Complainants’ well-known brands by misleading users.

The Complainants also support a finding of bad faith registration and use based on the attempt to impersonate the Complainants on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves. Additional bad faith factors can be found in the lack of right or legitimate interests or the reproduction of the Complainants' trademark in the corresponding site.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainants (hereinafter collectively referred to as 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 to 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 LE PORC GOURMET GRUPO JORGE 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, the letter "s" or the redaction of "grupo jorge" as the less prominent part of the mark, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letter 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 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 as applicable to this case: impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. As noted, the Complainant’s trademark, company name and business address for the first Complainant are fully reproduced in the Respondent’s website which avoids any legitimate use in terms of the Policy.

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 publishes on the website to which the disputed domain resolves to be the Complainant let alone the reproduction of the trademark. This allows the Panel to conclude that paragraph 4(b)(iv) applies since the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark which constitutes bad faith use.

Besides, the Panel looks at [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.3: “Noting that the scenarios enumerated in UDRP paragraph 4(b) are non-exhaustive, panels have applied 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”. Here and according to the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that the Respondent is disrupting the Complainant’s business as established 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.

The Panel finds apparent that the Respondent knew about the Complainants and its trademarks at the moment of the registration of the disputed domain name. Indeed, the reproduction of the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name and business name coupled with the subsequent use of the mark in the Respondent’s website further strengthens this finding of bad faith registration.

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 <leporcgourmets.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025