

## **PANEL DECISION**

The Pink Pig SA, Jorge Pork Meat SL v. Prime Domain Manager Limited  
Case No. DEU2025-0024

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainants are The Pink Pig SA, Spain (the “First Complainant”) and Jorge Pork Meat SL, Spain (the “Second Complainant”), (together the “Complainant”) represented by Integra, Spain.

The Respondent is Prime Domain Manager Limited, Cyprus.

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

The Registry of the disputed domain name <thepinkpigs.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains (“EURid” or the “Registry”). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is Marcaria.com LLC.

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 22, 2025. On September 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 25, 2025, the Registry 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 2, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “ADR Rules”) and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 6, 2025. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was October 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on November 11, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

#### **4. Factual Background**

The First Complainant, The Pink Pig SA, is a company within the Grupo Jorge group of companies. The Second Complainant, Jorge Pork Meat SL, is the parent company of the First Complainant and owns the trademarks on which this Complaint is based.

Grupo Jorge is a leading Spanish agribusiness group specializing in the production, processing, and commercialization of pork products. With vertically integrated operations, it manages the entire supply chain, including animal feed production, pig farming, slaughtering, meat processing, and distribution. The group exports a sizeable portion of its products to international markets, supplying fresh and processed pork to retailers, wholesalers, and food service companies worldwide. Its diversified activities also include renewable energy and agricultural crop production.

The Second Complaint is the owner of European Union Trade Mark No. 018021517, THE PINK PIG GRUPO JORGE (figurative), registered on October 28, 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 24, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's trademark in the top-left corner and is titled "THE PINK PIG S.A SPANISH PORK MEAT SUPPLIER" (the "Respondent's website"). The Respondent's website purports to provide information about the First Complainant, including information about a slaughterhouse in Zaragoza, Spain, a catalogue of products, and the names and portraits of individuals who are said to occupy senior positions in the company.

The disputed domain name was previously the subject of a Complaint filed by the Complainant. In that matter, the disputed domain name was being used to impersonate the Complainant. See *The Pink Pig SA, Jorge Pork Meat, SL v. blanco Jose Luiz*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2024-0026](#). The disputed domain name was revoked in accordance with the panel's decision at the request of the Complainant. The disputed domain name was subsequently reregistered and has been used in an effort to impersonate the Complainant once more, as noted above.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant asserts rights in the trademark THE PINK PIG GRUPO JORGE. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant. The Complainant notes in this regard that the Complainant's address appears on the Respondent's website. The Complainant asserts that offers have been made to third parties via the disputed domain name, further highlighting the Respondent's fraudulent use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name forms part of a larger group of abusive registrations targeting the Complainant, a number of which have been revoked or transferred to the Complainant further to the submission of successful domain name disputes. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain

name is being used for fraudulent purposes, in an attempt to cause confusion amongst the Complainant's customers and to impersonate the Complainant, in bad faith.

The Complainant requests revocation of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Multiple Complainants**

Neither the Regulation (EU) 2019/517 of the European Parliament and the Council of March 19, 2019 on the implementation and functioning of the .eu top-level domain name and amending and repealing Regulation (EC) No 733/2002 and repealing Commission Regulation (EC) No 874/2004 (the "Regulation") nor the ADR Rules expressly contemplate the possibility of an ADR complaint filed jointly by multiple complainants.

Prior decisions under the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP") have held that a single complaint filed by more than one complainant against a single respondent may be permitted under certain circumstances.<sup>1</sup>

The WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.1 states:

"In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation."

In this case, the Panel finds that both criteria are satisfied. The First Complainant and its parent company, the Second Complainant, are related entities within the same corporate group. The trademarks at issue are owned by the Second Complainant, and First Complainant is directly affected by the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, as detailed below. The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name therefore impacts both entities in a similar manner. The Panel further considers that allowing consolidation in this instance would be both equitable and procedurally efficient. Accordingly, the Panel finds that consolidation of the Complaint by the First Complainant, The Pink Pig SA, with reference to the trademark rights held by the Second Complainant, Jorge Pork Meat SL, is appropriate in this case. For the purposes of this decision, the First Complainant, The Pink Pig SA, and the Second Complainant, Jorge Pork Meat SL are collectively referred to as the "Complainant".

### **6.2. Identity of the Respondent**

On September 24, 2025, in a communication addressed to the Complainant, the Registrar indicated that the registrant of the disputed domain name was an individual of Argentina.

On September 25, 2025, further to the Center's verification request, the Registry confirmed that "Prime Domain Manager Limited" of Cyprus was the registrant of the disputed domain name, which was further confirmed on October 6, 2025, upon the Center's request.

---

<sup>1</sup> Noting the substantive and procedural similarities between the ADR Rules and the UDRP, the Panel finds it appropriate to refer to prior UDRP decisions, including as expressed in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Paragraph 1 of the ADR Rules defines the Respondent as “the holder of a .eu domain name registration (or the holder’s legal heirs or the Registry in the case of an ADR Proceeding against the Registry) in respect of which a Complaint and/or a request to change the language of the ADR Proceeding is initiated”.

The Panel notes that, while there is some indication that the disputed domain name may be held by “Prime Domain Manager Limited” on behalf of an ultimate beneficial owner, the record maintained by the Registry identifies “Prime Domain Manager Limited” of Cyprus as the current holder of the disputed domain name. In accordance with the ADR Rules, the proper Respondent is the entity listed as the holder in the Registry’s records at the time the Complaint was initiated.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complaint was correctly filed naming “Prime Domain Manager Limited” as the Respondent, and the Panel will proceed on that basis.

### **6.3. Substantive Matters**

Under Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, in order to prevail the Complainant must demonstrate that:

- (i) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or Community law and; either
- (ii) The domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interest in the name; or
- (iii) The domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

#### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law**

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the European Union Trade Mark THE PINK PIG GRUPO JORGE for purposes of the first element of the Policy. Panel assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) domain name and the textual components of the relevant mark. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

The disputed domain name comprises a substantial portion of the textual elements of the Complainant’s trademark, notably the words “the pink pig” followed by the letters “sa”. The Panel finds that the Complainant’s trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The addition of the letters “sa” do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark THE PINK PIG GRUPO JORGE. The Complainant has established the requirements of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules.

#### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

As noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the Complainant’s trademark and is titled “THE PINK PIG S.A SPANISH PORK MEAT SUPPLIER”. The website purports to provide information about the First Complainant, including details about a slaughterhouse in Zaragoza, Spain, a product catalogue, and the names and portraits of individuals said to be senior company officials, which according to the Complainant are false. The content of the website is clearly designed to give the impression that it is operated by, or is otherwise affiliated with, the Complainant.

The use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and to display its trademark and corporate information does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to Paragraph B(11)(e)(1) of the ADR Rules. Rather, such use is clearly intended to mislead Internet users and to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation and goodwill. Prior panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.

There is no evidence before the Panel to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of Paragraph B(11)(e)(2) of the ADR Rules.

Nor is the Respondent making any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name as contemplated by Paragraph B(11)(e)(3) of the ADR Rules.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The requirements of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules are therefore satisfied.

### **C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith**

Under Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules, the Complainant must demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's trademark, THE PINK PIG GRUPO JORGE, was registered well before the disputed domain name was registered on July 24, 2025. The Complainant, as part of the Grupo Jorge group, is an established participant in the Spanish and international pork industry, and its trademark enjoys recognition in the relevant sector.

As discussed under the preceding element, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's trademark and purports to provide information about the First Complainant, including details about its operations, products, and personnel. The Complainant has confirmed that the information presented on the Respondent's website is false and that the website is designed to impersonate the Complainant.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was previously the subject of a successful complaint by the Complainant, in which it was found that the disputed domain name was being used to impersonate the Complainant. Following the revocation of the disputed domain name, it was subsequently reregistered and is once again being used in an effort to impersonate the Complainant. The Panel finds it more likely than not that the same bad actor is behind the reregistration and subsequent use of the disputed domain name. This conduct demonstrates a clear intent to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation and to mislead Internet users for illegitimate purposes. In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Prior panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name to impersonate a complainant or to otherwise engage in fraudulent activity constitutes evidence bad faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. The present case falls squarely within this category of behaviour. The Panel further finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent has not come forward to file a Response or to provide any explanation for its conduct, nor has it produced any evidence to rebut the Complainant's allegations of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name has been both registered and is being used in bad faith. The requirements of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules are therefore satisfied.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <thepinkpigs.eu> be revoked.

*/Jane Seager/*

**Jane Seager**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 4, 2025