

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Le Porc Gourmet, SA, Jorge Pork Meat, SL v. Jose Carrera Buergo
Case No. D2026-1898

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 <leporcgourmet.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 May 1, 2026. On May 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 4, 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 (Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on May 5, 2026, 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 date.

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 May 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes as the sole panelist in this matter on June 2, 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 Complainants are a Spanish group of companies operating in livestock and pork meat production sector.

The Complainant, JORGE PORK MEAT, S.L., is the owner of European Union Trade Mark ("EUTM") registration no. 018021515 LE PORC GOURMET GRUPO JORGE, registered on July 20, 2019, in classes 29, 35 and 39.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 4, 2026. At the time of rendering this Decision, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves reproduces the Complainants' trademark and corporate address, as well as its logo.

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 contend that :

The disputed domain name forms part of a pattern of conduct, whereby the same individuals have repeatedly registered domain names incorporating slight variations of the Complainant's trademark and company name.

This pattern shows a continuous intention to create fraudulent websites that can be associated to the Complainants' identity, causing consumers confusion in respect to their real origin under false assumptions.

The recurrence of such domain names, sharing similar content, contact details, and structure, supports the inference that they are controlled by the same party or group, even when different registrant details are used.

The present dispute cannot be assessed in isolation, as the cumulative conduct evidences a continuing scheme aimed at exploiting the Complainants' reputation and disrupting its business operations.

The Complainant JORGE PORK MEAT, S.L., is the owner of EUTM registration n°018021515 LE PORC GOURMET GRUPO JORGE, registered on July 20, 2019 for products and services protected in classes 29, 35 and 39 and belongs to a broader family of trademarks associated with GRUPO JORGE, a well-established business group, thereby reinforcing its distinctiveness and recognition.

The disputed domain name incorporates almost in its entirety the Complainants' trademark, differing only by minor alterations (addition of "s" and omission of "r"), which are barely perceptible and do not prevent confusion.

The content of the website associated with the disputed domain name reproduces its trademark, without authorization, and even uses the Complainants' corporate address, particularly from Le Porc Gourmet, SA; it closely imitates its official website, including the display of logos, business presentation, and references to facilities; and contains a catalogue of products and a section of certificates that the Complainants claim are entirely false and misleading, creating a risk of fraud for consumers.

The Respondent has not been authorized to use its trademark and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there are not any legitimate right or interest to support its registration. The domain name constitutes a case of typosquatting, intended to exploit user confusion and to mislead Internet users for commercial gain through impersonation.

The Respondent registered and is using the domain name to impersonate the Complainants' business, reproduce its content, and divert Internet users to a fraudulent website offering similar products.

Based on the above-mentioned allegations, the Complainants request that the disputed domain name be cancelled.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove: i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights; ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and iii) that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name 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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

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

The first part of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, the only differences is that the letter "r" has been removed from the Word "gourmet" and a letter "s" has been included at the end. Where the assessment of confusing similarity benefits from contextual elements, panels may take into account the content of the website associated with the domain name to assess whether the respondent has targeted the complainant's mark, and such content may serve to affirm a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.15.

In the present case, the website associated with the disputed domain name prominently display the LE PORC GOURMET GRUPO JORGE mark in its entirety.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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 disputed domain name is a misspelled version of one of the Complainant’s company names and resolves to an impersonating website. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainants have submitted sufficient evidence to conclude that there is indeed bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

This conclusion is reached based on the Panel’s findings below:

Considering the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name proven by the Complainants, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered with the purpose of creating confusion. Moreover, noting that the disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of one of the Complainant’s names, it must also be concluded that it is not plausible that the creation of the disputed domain name was the result of an exercise of inventiveness on the part of the Respondent, but rather that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainants and/or their trademarks

Furthermore, the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name currently reproduces the Complainants’ trademark, company name and logo as well as references to the Complainants’ products so the Panel also concludes that the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by causing a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants’ trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website in accordance to paragraph 4b(iv) of the Policy.

For all these reasons, the Panel determines that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <leporcgoumets.com> be cancelled.

/Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes/

Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes

Sole Panelist

Date: June 16, 2026