

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SF Investments, Inc., Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp. v. Blanco Jose Luis Case No. D2024-1737

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SF Investments, Inc., Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp., United States of America, represented internally.

The Respondent is Blanco Jose Luis, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <smithfieldfreshmeats.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 25, 2024. On April 25, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 29, 2024, 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 (Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 2024, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 1, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 3, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 23, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 29, 2024.

The Center appointed Nicholas Weston as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 2024. 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 collectively comprised of two subsidiaries of Smithfield Foods, Inc., a company that operates the world's largest pork production business. The Complainant holds registrations for the trademark SMITHFIELD and variations of it in the United States, including Trademark Registration No. 2624764, registered September 24, 2002, in International Class 29, with a first use in commerce date of 1936.

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name <smithfieldfreshmeats.com> on March 30, 2024, and it currently resolves to an inactive webpage.

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 cites several of its US trademark registrations for the mark SMITHFIELD and variations of it, as prima facie evidence of ownership.

The Complainant submits that the mark SMITHFIELD is well-known and that its rights in that mark predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name. It submits that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark, because the Disputed Domain Name is comprised of the SMITHFIELD trademark and "is identical to [one of the Complainant's] corporate legal name Smithfield Fresh Meats [Corp]."

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because "Respondent has no legitimate interest in the subject domain name and does not own any registered or unregistered rights in the SMITHFIELD name" and none of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy apply.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was, and currently is, in bad faith, contrary to the Policy and the Rules having regard to the prior use and well-known nature of the Complainant's trademark. It submits that the Complainant was targeted given that "the dominant element ... is an exact copy of co-Complainant's corporate legal name Smithfield Fresh Meats [Corp.]" and, on the issue of use, advances the argument that "using Complainants' stylized trademark in the top left corner of the website" would not prevent a finding of bad faith for passive holding.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

- (i) that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. The Complainant has produced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has registered trademark rights in the mark SMITHFIELD in the US. The requirements of the first element for purposes of the Policy may be satisfied by a trademark registered in any country. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Turning to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the SMITHFIELD trademark, the Panel observes that the Disputed Domain Name is comprised of: (a) an exact reproduction of the Complainant's trademark SMITHFIELD; (b) followed by the word "fresh"; (c) followed by the word "meats"; (d) followed by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com".

It is well established that the gTLD used as part of a domain name is generally disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11. The relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name, specifically: "smithfieldfreshmeats".

The Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name and is recognizable in 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.

Although the addition of the words "fresh meats", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these words 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.

The Panel notes the evidence that the Disputed Domain Name <smithfieldfreshmeats.com> resolves to an inactive webpage, which supports the Complainant's evidence, and finds that this does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, given the substantial reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's mark or capacity to otherwise mislead Internet users.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

On the issue of registration, taking into account the composition of the Disputed Domain Name and the distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant's trademark SMITHFIELD when it registered the Disputed Domain Name (see *SF Investments, Inc. v. Mike John, SS inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0028](#) ("Complainant's inherently distinctive mark, which has been used in the United States for over 70 years").

This Panel finds that there is no reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Name other than to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's well-known trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, a gap of several years between registration of a complainant's trademark and respondent's registration of a disputed domain name (containing the trademark) can indicate bad faith registration. In this case, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name at least 88 years after the Complainant established registered trademark rights in the SMITHFIELD mark.

On the issue of use, the Complainant's evidence is that the Disputed Domain Name does not currently resolve to an active website.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of

false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the Complainant's distinctive trademark, and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under 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 <smithfieldfreshmeats.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Weston/

Nicholas Weston

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2024