

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

JBS USA Food Company Holdings v. Aze OneBlinkz  
Case No. D2026-1531

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is JBS USA Food Company Holdings, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Erise IP, P.A., United States.

The Respondent is Aze OneBlinkz, Cameroon.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <jbscrap.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 10, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 14, 2026, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 14, 2026, 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 April 17, 2026.

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 April 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on May 18, 2026. 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 United States meat processing company, which conducts its business under the name and trademark JBS. The Complainant states that its wholly owned holding company, Swift Brands Company, acts as a holding company and record owner for many of the Complainant's intellectual property assets. Among others, said company is the owner of United States Registered Trademark Number 4019805 for a word mark consisting of the letters JBS, registered on August 30, 2011, in Classes 29, 39, 40, and 44.

On October 3, 2023, Swift Brands Company applied for a United States trademark registration under Serial Number 98207616 in respect of a device mark consisting of the letters "jbs" placed between a pair of curved line groups; the first group has three curved lines that are located to the left of the letters and the second group of curved lines are located to the right of the letters. Said mark has not yet proceeded to grant, although the Complainant provides evidence that it began using the said mark on its website at "www.jbsfoodsgroup.com" in the colors light green, light blue, and dark blue at least as early as March 21, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 8, 2024. Little is known about the Respondent, which has not participated in the administrative proceeding, other than that it appears to be a private individual with an address in Cameroon.

Based upon archived and recent screenshots produced by the Complainant, the history of the website associated with the disputed domain name appears to be as follows:

(1) As of November 9, 2024, a site for a company named Acre Metals Ltd, allegedly dealing in scrap metal in Africa and other locations, under a logo consisting of the words "ACRE METALS LTD" (capitalized as such) with a black letter "A" above and a gold letter "M" beneath. Said company's contact addresses are listed as addresses in Chicago, United States, and London, United Kingdom, together with a Gmail based email address. The telephone number for the alleged United States company appears to be a United States telephone number with an area code for Montana rather than Chicago. There is no telephone number given for the alleged United Kingdom company.

(2) As of March 30, 2026, a largely identical site for a scrap metal company whereby the term "Acre Metals Ltd" on the previous site has been replaced with the term "JBS Group USA", and the logo has been replaced with the Complainant's logo, described above, in the identical color scheme. The contact address of the purported company now lists only an office in the United States, and reproduces the Complainant's corporate address in Colorado as its contact address, together with an email address using a domain name <jbsgroupusa.com> (registered on March 19, 2025). The telephone number given for the alleged company appears to be a United States telephone number with an area code for North Carolina rather than Colorado.

(3) As of April 17, 2026, being one week after the Complaint was filed, a largely identical site for a scrap metal company whereby the term "JBS Group USA" on the previous site has been replaced with the term "JB Scrap Metals" and featuring a new logo consisting of the letters "j" and "b" in a gold colored shape with the words "METALS EST 1984". The contact address of the purported company now lists offices in Chicago, United States (albeit a different Chicago address to the one in version (1) above), and Wigan, United Kingdom. The telephone number listed for the United States company has not changed and remains under a North Carolina area code. The telephone number for the United Kingdom office is a United Kingdom mobile telephone number. The email address is unchanged from version (2) above.

The Complainant has identified a Chicago, United States, company dealing in scrap metal which uses the logo reproduced in version (3) of the website associated with the disputed domain name described above, together with the address used in version (1) as that of one of its corporate locations. Based on its website content, this company is not named “JB Scrap Metals”.

None of the Respondent’s details on the RDAP data associated with the disputed domain name reflect any connection to or association with the various companies featured on the website associated with the disputed domain name.

## **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 name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s JBS mark, whether or not the disputed domain name is regarded as containing a pejorative term. The Complainant adds that the disputed domain name may be interpreted as either “JBS crap” or “JBS scrap”, where the term “scrap” is telescoped into the letter “s” of “JBS”.

The Complainant notes that the application for and use of its design mark predates the use of the Complainant’s logo in version (2) of the website at the disputed domain name, adding that it has used said mark since at least as early as March 21, 2024. The Complainant contends that the use of the JBS trademark and design mark on the website associated with the disputed domain name will mislead consumers and suggests that the disputed domain name is affiliated, sponsored by, owned by or otherwise associated with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that between the filing of the original Complaint and amended Complaint, the Respondent updated the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name to remove references to the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant adds that the present iteration of the said website continues to use an email address that incorporates the Complainant’s JBS trademark.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not affiliated with, endorsed or sponsored by, or an authorized licensee of the Complainant, adding that the Respondent could not be considered to be making nominative fair use of the Complainant’s trademark because the contact addresses and website banners deprive the depicted business of a bona fide character. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, is not an authorized distributor or provider of the Complainant’s goods or services, and is not affiliated with any such authorized distributors. The Complainant adds that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name but rather is using it for commercial gain to mislead consumers.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant acquired rights in the JBS trademark, adding that the website associated with the disputed domain name used the Complainant’s mark and copied the Complainant’s design mark until just after the Complainant filed the Complaint. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent used its marks in connection with scrap metal services to palm off the Complainant’s goodwill and reputation in order to mislead consumers, adding that the Respondent held itself out as being the Complainant for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website, and that the modification of said website after the filing of the Complaint does not cure or negate such behavior, but rather demonstrates the Respondent’s awareness of its infringing conduct and constitutes an attempt to evade liability under the Policy.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent’s shift from representing various entities in website iterations (1), (2), and (3) (described in the factual background section above) reflects a pattern of intent to mislead consumers and exploit third-party goodwill by referencing multiple unrelated entities over time that are not

affiliated with the Respondent, supporting a finding of registration and use in bad faith. The Complainant also notes that the Respondent has attempted to conceal its identity by having its personal information redacted from publicly available data, as part of its bad faith actions.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

A trademark owner's affiliate such as, here, a parent company filing a UDRP case on the basis of rights held in the name of one of the companies or brands under its corporate umbrella is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.4.1.

The entirety of the JBS 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "crap", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc"), here ".com", is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

The evidence before the Panel clearly shows that the Respondent has adopted the Complainant's corporate identity including its address, trademark, and its as-yet unregistered design trademark in the form of the JBS logo that the Complainant has been using since at least March 2024, in order to represent itself as the Complainant or at least as affiliated with the Complainant. While the Respondent has done this in connection with scrap metal, being a business in which the Complainant does not engage, there can nevertheless be no doubt that the Respondent intended to misrepresent itself as the Complainant based on iteration (2) of the website associated with the disputed domain name as described in the factual background section above.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed corporate impersonation and passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

For completeness, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not engaged in the making of noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, for example, to express criticism of the Complainant as the composition of the disputed domain name might have suggested, if read as the Complainant's JBS trademark coupled with the pejorative term "crap". On the contrary, the Panel considers that the Complainant's alternative reading of the disputed domain name as constituting the Complainant's JBS trademark coupled with the word "scrap" where the letter "s" is shared or "telescoped" is the preferred reading because the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name has been used to clone the Complainant's corporate identity while at the same time purporting to be that of a scrap metal dealer, whereby the letters "crap" could not be intended to be read as such.

The Respondent has not engaged with the administrative proceeding and has provided no submissions or evidence which might have suggested that it had any claim to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the absence of such, the Panel has not been able to identify any potential rights and legitimate interests that the Respondent might have attempted to claim had it chosen to participate in this matter.

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 has used the disputed domain name in connection with a range of corporate identities including that of the Complainant, presumably with a view to conferring some form of legitimacy on its alleged scrap metal dealing business. There is no apparent connection between any of the businesses depicted on the websites associated with the disputed domain name and the Respondent's identity as shown on the RDAP data.

While the disputed domain name could be read as "JB scrap", which might have suggested that the Complainant's JBS mark was not necessarily being targeted by the Respondent, this notion is immediately dispelled by the fact that iteration (2) of the website associated with the disputed domain name, described above, directly referenced the Complainant's distinctive as-yet unregistered design mark along with the Complainant's corporate address. It would appear therefore that the Respondent selected a group of corporate identities in which to cloak itself, including the Complainant's identity, and then registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's JBS mark with the intent to switch between these

identities at will, potentially at the point when a previous identity is called into question. This possibility is particularly evident in the fact that the Respondent switched its alleged corporate identity away from the iteration using the Complainant's logo, trademark and address within about a week of the Complaint being filed. The final iteration, referencing a company using the letters "JB" together with the word "scrap" might have been convincing as a potentially legitimate use of the disputed domain name for a scrap metal dealership but for the fact that there is ample evidence before the Panel that a variety of identities has been deployed to which the Respondent has no apparent connection, notably that of the Complainant in iteration (2) which uses the Complainant's distinctive logo and corporate address, such hypothesis is readily discarded.

The Respondent's ultimate purpose for the disputed domain name and associated website cannot be determined with certainty on the present record. What can be determined, however, is the fact that the Respondent adopted the corporate identity of others, including the Complainant, to represent itself as a bona fide dealer in scrap metal. While the Complainant's business is entirely unrelated to that line, the fact that the Respondent unequivocally adopted the Complainant's identity on its website means that it must have intended to target it, presumably because it would derive some commercial benefit therefrom by associating itself with a legitimate United States business with a lengthy trading history and longstanding trademark. In terms of the Policy, this could in no way be described as a use in good faith, nor could registration of a domain name for the purpose of cloning a series of corporate identities (including that of the Complainant) be regarded as registration in good faith. The fact that the Respondent may have gone on to target (or at least to represent itself as) a third party business shortly after the filing of the Complaint in no way negates the Complainant's case on this topic, and indeed is a further indication of bad faith in the present circumstances because the timing suggests that the Respondent took this action in an attempt to avoid liability under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed corporate impersonation and passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

As noted in the immediately preceding section of this Decision, the Respondent has not engaged with the administrative proceeding. It has neither addressed the Complainant's contentions on this topic nor produced either submissions or evidence which might have suggested that it registered and used the disputed domain name in good faith or that it had rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the absence of any response from the Respondent, the Panel cannot identify any matters which it might have raised in support of its case on this element of the Policy.

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 <jbscrap.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrew D. S. Lothian/*

**Andrew D. S. Lothian**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 1, 2026