



Internal Awareness Briefing: Caerphilly Bird Rescue Name Dispute & Conduct Report

Confidential – Internal document for information awareness (leaked for public transparency)

Introduction & Scope

This report documents a **trademark dispute and related misconduct** surrounding the name “**Caerphilly Bird Rescue**”, focusing on events in late 2025 and early 2026. It covers the **unauthorized appropriation of a long-standing rescue name**, the **public conduct of the new operator**, instances of **misrepresentation of legal authority**, and the ensuing **reputational conflict**. The findings draw on public records, social media posts, and statements by involved parties. All information is presented in a matter-of-fact manner with supporting evidence, given the significant public interest in transparency and animal welfare governance.

Background: Original Rescue vs New Claim

Caerphilly Bird Rescue was an established local wildlife rescue in Caerphilly (South Wales) with a history spanning over **33 years** ¹. It was co-founded by **Carol Gravenor** and her late husband **Ray Gravenor**, who was widely known as “**The Bird Man**” for his decades of rescue work ². The original rescue operated lawfully for decades, but in 2023 it was effectively shut down after Carol Gravenor (67) admitted to several animal welfare offences. In January 2024, a court imposed a **lifetime ban** on her keeping animals, following an RSPCA inspection that found numerous birds in poor conditions ³ ⁴. This enforcement action marked an end to the original **Caerphilly Bird Rescue** as it then existed. Despite this outcome, Ms. Gravenor has emphasized that the rescue remains her family’s legacy and that a scaled-down continuation is being maintained by a family member ¹.

In late 2025, a **newly formed venture** began using a confusingly similar name: “**The New Caerphilly Bird & Small Animal Rescue Sanctuary**”. This venture is led by **Ms. Jayne Price** – an individual **also known by the name Carrie-Anne Ridsdale** ⁵. Ms. Price is the operator of *Jayne’s Baby Bank*, a Community Interest Company (CIC) focused on charitable baby supplies, and has now expanded into claiming an animal rescue operation. For consistency, this report refers to her as **Jayne Price** (the name under which official filings were made). It should be noted that evidence from incorporation records links the **Price** and **Ridsdale** identities, despite public denials of any alias, providing **documentary confirmation** of the connection ⁵. The **new rescue initiative** promoted by Jayne Price is **not an outgrowth of the original** Caerphilly Bird Rescue; instead, it represents an **independent attempt to capitalize on that name**. Jayne’s Baby Bank publicly announced that it had “**taken over Caerphilly Bird Rescue**” and was re-opening it under a new name, asserting that the original operation had “fallen into disrepute” and that the previous owner had received a lifetime ban for animal cruelty (a reference to the 2023 court case) ⁶ [17†L107-L115]. **This claim** implied a transfer of ownership or endorsement **of the original rescue’s legacy to the new operators**. No evidence of any official transfer or permission **was provided, and the original founder** emphatically refuted** these statements (detailed below).

Trademark Filing vs. Legal Reality

Central to this dispute is a **trademark application** that Jayne Price filed for the new venture's name. On **26 December 2025**, an application was lodged with the UK Intellectual Property Office (IPO) under number **UK00004316067** ⁷. The mark, described as *"The New Caerphilly Bird and Small Animal Rescue Sanctuary,"* was filed in **Class 36 (Fundraising)** and is owned by **Jayne Price** ⁷ ⁸. The application appears to be for a **figurative mark** (i.e. a logo or stylized version of the name) ⁷. **Importantly, this trademark is currently only an application – it has been published (Journal 2026/003) but is not yet registered** ⁸. **As such, it confers no enforceable legal rights** at this stage.**

It is crucial to understand the **limited scope of what a trademark (especially a pending one) represents**. A trademark registration is merely a form of **brand protection**; it **does not in itself establish a charity or grant permission to operate an animal rescue** ⁹. In this case, the application covers the name for fundraising purposes only. **What a trademark is not** ¹⁰:

- **Not a charity registration:** Filing a trademark **does not register the venture as a charity** or nonprofit entity ¹¹.
- **Not a CIC or company registration:** It **does not create a registered Community Interest Company or other company** for the rescue operations ¹¹. (At the time of writing, there is **no registered company or CIC specifically for "The New Caerphilly..." rescue** ¹²; Jayne's Baby Bank has indicated that the rescue is a *future* project awaiting formal CIC registration and funding ¹³.)
- **No animal welfare license:** A trademark **does not authorize any animal rescue activities** or confer animal welfare licenses/permits ¹¹. Actual rescue work would require compliance with animal welfare regulations and possibly licensing, which a trademark alone cannot provide.
- **No proof of standards or compliance:** It **does not demonstrate any compliance with safeguarding, governance, or veterinary standards** that bona fide animal charities are expected to uphold ¹¹.
- **Not an enforcement tool (civil, not criminal):** Owning (or applying for) a trademark **does not create a criminal offence** if others use a similar name; trademark disputes are generally civil matters, not criminal ¹⁴.

Despite these legal realities, Jayne's Baby Bank has **publicly misrepresented the nature of trademark rights** in an attempt to warn off critics and others using the name. Notably, Jayne Price **asserted in a public post** that **"It is Trademarked and breach of Trademarked law is a criminal offence not civil."** ¹⁵. *This statement is legally incorrect.* In UK law, **trademark infringement is typically a civil issue**, and a **pending application** grants no rights at all ¹⁶. Criminal sanctions apply only in extreme cases like **counterfeit goods**, not in simple use of a similar name in a non-commercial context. The IPO application in question was (and remains) **pending**, meaning **no exclusive rights exist yet**. **Portraying a mere application as an "enforceable" trademark** – and further claiming criminal liability for infringement – is a **misleading and false assertion** ¹². Such misuse of legal terminology appears aimed at **intimidating others** or silencing dissent. In reality, at this stage **"Caerphilly Bird Rescue" is not owned by Jayne Price in any legal sense** beyond the *intent* to register a brand name for fundraising. Furthermore, even a successful trademark registration (if and when granted) **would not retrospectively legitimize any past conduct** or confer authority to run a rescue without proper organizational registration and regulatory compliance.

False Takeover Claims & Legacy Reputational Conflict

From the outset, the **branding and communications** by Jayne's Baby Bank regarding *"The New Caerphilly..."* have suggested a **continuation of the original Caerphilly Bird Rescue**, which has caused

significant **confusion and concern**. The chosen name itself – “**The New Caerphilly Bird & Small Animal Rescue Sanctuary**” – differs only slightly from the historic name, implicitly **trading on the original rescue’s reputation**. This raises what internal observers called a risk of “**brand hijacking**” and **public confusion**, falsely implying there is continuity or an official handover ¹⁷. In reality, **no such handover occurred** ¹⁸.

In early communications (January 2026), Jayne’s Baby Bank **announced publicly** that “we have taken over Caerphilly Bird Rescue” and claimed the original operation had ended in disgrace (mentioning it “*fell into disrepute*” and highlighting the former owner’s ban). The new operator positioned herself as reviving or saving the rescue under new management. This narrative is **contested by the original founders**. In response, **Carol Gravenor – the original co-founder of Caerphilly Bird Rescue – issued a public statement refuting** the takeover claims ⁶. Ms. Gravenor made it clear that **Jayne Price has no legitimate connection to the original rescue**. Key points from Ms. Gravenor’s statement include ¹:

- **Origins & Legacy:** “*Caerphilly Bird Rescue was founded 33 years ago by [Carol] and her late husband, Ray Gravenor.*” It is explicitly characterized as **Ray’s legacy**, built over decades ¹.
- **No Transfer of Ownership:** “*The rescue has not been sold, transferred, or taken over by Jayne Price or Jayne’s Baby Bank.*” In other words, **no permission or agreement was given** for anyone else to assume the name or operations ¹⁹.
- **Continued Family Involvement:** “*A scaled-down continuation of the rescue is still being run by a family member.*” Despite the earlier enforcement action, the family has not entirely disbanded the rescue effort (albeit on a smaller scale), underscoring that the **original rescue line is not defunct** ²⁰.
- **Denial of New Claim’s Legitimacy:** “*Jayne Price has nothing to do with Caerphilly Bird Rescue.*” This unequivocal statement reinforces that **the new venture is an unconnected initiative**, not recognized by the original custodians of the name ²⁰.

Ms. Gravenor went on to condemn Jayne Price’s behaviour in strong terms. She described the claims of “re-opening” Caerphilly Bird Rescue under a new name as “**unscrupulous**” and “**misleading**,” characterizing it as “**an attempt to monetise an established name.**” ² Her public message included a direct warning: “**PLEASE BE AWARE THIS WOMAN IS NOTHING TO DO WITH CAERPHILLY BIRD RESCUE. ... This woman is unscrupulous and has no rescue, no birds, nothing but sees a way to make money.**” ²¹ Such language from the original operator indicates the depth of the **reputational conflict** – the new group’s actions are viewed as a **cynical appropriation of decades of goodwill** associated with the rescue. Ms. Gravenor also **challenged the narrative** that the original rescue was entirely discredited: while acknowledging the ban she herself received, she **refuted certain public statements made by Jayne Price about enforcement outcomes**, calling them false or “**materially exaggerated.**” ²² In essence, the founder implies that Jayne Price has overstated or misrepresented aspects of the case (potentially to further justify the “takeover”).

From a public interest perspective, these conflicting claims created a **dangerous confusion**. Longtime supporters of Caerphilly Bird Rescue might mistakenly believe the new sanctuary is a legitimate continuation or that it has the blessing of the original founders or authorities, when in fact **the original founder repudiates it**. The **brand confusion** also risks donors or animal patrons being misled. There is **no evidence** that any of the original rescue’s assets, license, or charitable status (if any) were transferred to Jayne’s Baby Bank ¹⁷. In the absence of such a transfer, using an almost identical name constitutes a **de facto hijacking of the brand identity** of a 33-year-old rescue. Regulatory bodies would likely view this as a misrepresentation if donors are being led to think they are supporting the known, established rescue. Indeed, internal analysis noted that **reusing the near-identical name**

“creates material public confusion and falsely implies continuity, endorsement, or regulatory legitimacy” where none exists ¹⁷ .

Misleading Promotion & Public Conduct Incidents

Beyond the issue of the name itself, the **conduct of the new venture’s operator** has raised serious red flags. Multiple instances of **misinformation, deceptive promotion, and unprofessional public behaviour** have been documented:

1. “Stolen” Fox Image Incident (24 January 2026): On this date, **Jayne’s Baby Bank** made a Facebook post under the branding of *“The New Caerphilly Bird & Small Animal Rescue Sanctuary.”* The post featured a photograph of a fox and was captioned **“Look who snook in through the cat flap! Pontypool and Caerphilly fundraising shops open today.”** ²³ . The image also had an overlay promoting the fundraiser shops. The clear implication of this post was that a wild fox had wandered into the rescue’s facilities (through a cat flap), suggesting that the new sanctuary was already active and interacting with wildlife. This **created a completely false impression** – namely that **the rescue had a physical premises and ongoing animal encounters** ²⁴ . In truth, **the fox photograph was not taken at any property of Jayne’s Baby Bank at all.** It was **lifted from a private individual’s TikTok video** without permission ²⁵ . The fox pictured was actually inside the home of a man named David Lovett, who quickly **recognized his content and publicly challenged the misuse** of his image ²⁵ . Once confronted, Jayne’s Baby Bank deleted the fox post. **No apology or public correction** was issued after this deletion ²⁶ .

This incident is significant for several reasons: it shows a willingness by the new rescue’s promoters to **fabricate a narrative** (in this case, a feel-good rescue scenario) to engage the public and solicit funds. Using a random fox image to imply “here’s what’s happening at our sanctuary today” is a **serious misrepresentation** – it deceives the audience about the existence of facilities and activities, and effectively trades on someone else’s content. It also demonstrates a **lack of transparency or remorse**; the post was quietly removed once caught, with no acknowledgment of the error. This kind of deceptive promotion undermines trust and poses ethical questions about how the venture is being marketed to potential donors.

2. False Attribution and Narrative Shifting: Rather than take responsibility for the fox image episode, the response from Jayne’s Baby Bank was to **deny and deflect**. After the deletion, the operator **claimed that a “fake page” or impersonator was responsible** for the fox post, suggesting that it hadn’t come from their official account ²⁷ . This claim was demonstrably **false**. Independent screen recordings captured the post **live on the official Jayne’s Baby Bank Facebook profile**, including the profile’s name on the post and the reactions from followers, proving it was genuinely posted by that account ²⁸ . A third-party imposter page **could not have inserted a post into the real page’s feed** with real follower engagement, as was observed. The video evidence utterly **disproves the “fake page” explanation** ²⁹ . In effect, the operator attempted to rewrite the history of the incident by blaming a non-existent culprit – an evasive tactic to avoid accountability.

Additionally, Jayne’s Baby Bank published a follow-up message concocting a **straw man allegation**: they claimed that *critics* were saying the rescue had been “selling animals” (specifically accusing them of selling the fox) ³⁰ . In reality, **no one had made such an accusation** – it was a fabricated claim introduced by the operator. This tactic **diverted attention** from the real issue (misuse of the image and false representation of rescue activity) and instead painted the operator as a victim of ridiculous rumors ³⁰ . By knocking down this invented allegation, the operator attempted to garner sympathy and discredit critics, while sidestepping the genuine criticism about honesty. This is a clear example of

narrative substitution: when faced with legitimate criticism, a new, false narrative was injected to muddy the waters.

3. Misuse of Legal Terminology and Law Enforcement Claims: A recurring aspect of the public conduct observed in this case is the **misrepresentation of legal authority** – essentially, invoking the law or police in questionable ways to **intimidate critics or lend false weight** to the operator’s statements. We have already seen one example of this in the trademark context (claiming criminal liability for trademark “breach”). Further patterns have been documented:

- **Threats of Legal Action and Police Involvement:** The operator’s communications frequently reference having reported individuals to the police, having court orders against “trolls,” or other enforcement outcomes. The **profile associated with Jayne’s Baby Bank has repeatedly claimed various enforcement victories over critics**, such as restraining orders (CROs), police interviews, and pending legal action ³¹. These claims are presented in a triumphant manner, as if to show that anyone who criticizes their operation will face legal consequences. However, an analysis of these assertions finds **no evidence of actual court orders or verified police action** to back them up ³². The **same critics continue to be openly critical** long after these supposed enforcement measures, which strongly suggests that the claims of police “sorting them out” are either false or exaggerated ³³. In other words, **asserting that the police or courts have taken action (when they have not) is being used as a public intimidation tactic**.
- **Using Police/Authority as a Public Weapon:** Internally, this pattern has been described as the use of “**police and legal language as a public weapon**.” The operator often speaks in a manner invoking law enforcement or regulatory agencies to bolster her position in disputes ³⁴. For example, she has publicly implied that regulators (like the CIC regulator or local councils) have validated her complaints against others, or that officials are monitoring her detractors in some official capacity ³⁵ ³⁶. These implications are typically **misleading or unfounded**, as genuine regulatory bodies do not operate in the way she describes (e.g., there is no “fraud squad” of the Welsh Assembly that confirms identities of Facebook critics, contrary to her video claims ³⁷). Such statements serve to **mislead the public** about the level of official endorsement or involvement in her cause and to **deter critics** by suggesting any complaint or critique will boomerang through authorities.
- **Intimidation to Silence Complaints:** There is evidence that Ms. Price (under her various names) has attempted to **scare potential whistleblowers into silence**. In one documented instance, she told people that if anyone files a complaint about her activities (with CIC regulators or other bodies), those authorities would “automatically” inform her of the complainant’s identity, and that she would then take that to the police as evidence of harassment ³⁸. This is **false and inaccurate** – regulators do not breach confidentiality of whistleblowers, and making a legitimate complaint is not a criminal act. The **only purpose of such a statement is to intimidate people from reporting concerns** ³⁸. It creates a chilling effect, suggesting that speaking up will result in retaliation and police involvement.
- **Harassment and Defamation Concerns:** The tone adopted by the operator towards critics has often been **hostile and personal**. Internal review of her social media videos and posts (as part of Jayne’s Baby Bank’s CIC oversight) noted **explicit threats and derogatory language** used against specific individuals (including volunteers of other charities) ³⁹ ⁴⁰. She has accused others of serious misconduct (fraud, etc.) without evidence ⁴¹, which verges on defamation. This pattern of aggressive communication – “having all the time in the world to come after” individuals, or telling them to “look out” ⁴² – goes beyond normal discourse and enters the realm of harassment. Such behaviour not only raises **ethical and legal issues** (potential libel or

harassment violations) but is also **antithetical to the expected conduct of a community interest company director**. It paints a picture of an operator more focused on silencing dissent and attacking rivals than on the charitable mission.

Taken together, these behaviours – from the fox image fabrication to the false legal threats – establish a **pattern of misrepresentation and intimidation**. There is a consistent strategy apparent: **promote the new venture by any means (even false imagery and claims), and aggressively shut down any questioning by invoking law or authority without basis**. This pattern has repeatedly been described as **deceptive and unsafe public messaging** by those monitoring the situation ⁴³, because it not only misleads supporters but also undermines trust in genuine charitable processes and legal frameworks.

Statement from Original Founder (Public Refutation)

In light of the above developments, it is important to highlight the **official public refutation by the original rescue's founder**, as it directly addresses and corrects several of the new group's assertions. On 25 January 2026, **Ms. Carol Gravenor** released a detailed public statement (via social media) clarifying the history and current status of Caerphilly Bird Rescue, and responding to Jayne's Baby Bank's claims ⁶. Key excerpts from Ms. Gravenor's statement were documented for the record:

- *"CAERPHILLY BIRD RESCUE IS RAY'S LEGACY."* – Emphasizing the personal and historical significance of the rescue, tying it to her late husband's life work ⁴⁴.
- *"PLEASE BE AWARE THIS WOMAN IS NOTHING TO DO WITH CAERPHILLY BIRD RESCUE."* – A direct warning to the public that Jayne Price (though not named here, clearly implied) is not associated with the real Caerphilly Bird Rescue in any capacity ²¹.
- *"This woman is unscrupulous and has no rescue, no birds, nothing but sees a way to make money."* – A sharp condemnation of motive, accusing the new operator of acting in bad faith for profit, and stating that she does not actually have any rescue operations or animals in care ⁴⁵.

Ms. Gravenor's statement also tackled some **factual corrections**. For instance, Jayne's Baby Bank had implied that the original rescue was completely defunct and tarnished due to the animal welfare case. In response, Ms. Gravenor clarified that **while she personally can no longer run the rescue (due to the ban), a family member is continuing a small-scale rescue effort** so that *some* of the work continues legitimately ¹⁸. She also disputed how Jayne Price portrayed the enforcement action and its outcome, suggesting that certain claims (likely around the nature of the ban or how it was represented) were **exaggerated or false** ²². This is significant because it indicates that not only is the new group unconnected, they may also be **spreading misleading information about the old group's demise** to justify their takeover. Ms. Gravenor's public intervention serves as a **record from the primary source** (the founder) that the **"New Caerphilly" venture is not a continuation in any legitimate sense** ⁴⁶.

The original founder's stance underscores a broader point: the **historic Caerphilly Bird Rescue name carries public trust**, and any misuse of it can harm that legacy. In her statement, one can sense the personal distress at seeing decades of hard work (albeit ending unfortunately with the RSPCA case) being co-opted by an unrelated party. For the public and any regulators, Ms. Gravenor's input provides clarity that **the new venture is operating without the approval or involvement of those who built the original rescue**, and indeed against their express wishes.

Broader Context and Pattern of Behaviour

It is worth noting that the issues observed with Jayne's Baby Bank's foray into animal rescue are **not isolated incidents**. Evidence suggests a **recurring pattern** of similar behaviour by the same operator in different contexts:

- **Previous Unfounded "Rescue" Claims:** Before attempting to adopt "Caerphilly Bird Rescue," the operator had made past claims about running other rescue organizations. In one archived post, she claimed to have previously operated a "*small rescue CIC*" from 2017–2020 called **"The Forever Home Rescue and Sanctuary"** (formerly "The Last Stop Rescue") ⁴⁷. She used this claim to bolster her credentials, implying she had hands-on rescue experience. However, an audit of official records found **no such CIC was ever registered** under those names ⁴⁸. In other words, she presented a **fictional or unregistered rescue venture as if it were real**, again in a bid to enhance credibility. This establishes a **pattern of false or unverified organisational claims** in her narrative, consistent with the misrepresentations seen in the Caerphilly case.
- **Community Conflict and Hoaxes:** Jayne's Baby Bank itself has been involved in numerous local disputes and controversies unrelated to animal rescue – from accusations against other charities to questionable fundraising practices. Internal reviews (as cited in "*The Welsh Charity Shop Hoax: Exposed!*" report) highlight **patterns of hostile communications, unsubstantiated allegations of fraud against others, and even instances of using fake personas on social media** ⁴⁹ ⁵⁰. The consistent theme is an apparent attempt to position herself (or her organization) as superior by **tearing down perceived competition or critics**, often with dubious claims. This adversarial approach in the charity sphere has now been transposed onto the animal rescue sphere.
- **Regulatory Attention:** The sum of these behaviours has not gone unnoticed. There have been multiple complaints and ongoing scrutiny from authorities like local councils, the Charity Commission, and the CIC regulator. Although specific outcomes of any investigations are not publicly known, it is documented that **police and council have been informed on multiple occasions** about incidents involving the operator ⁵¹ ⁵². The operator's strategy in response has been to publicly claim vindication ("the police are dealing with trolls") while privately the issues persist. This cycle further erodes trust and indicates potential escalation if not checked.

From a risk assessment perspective, the **"New Caerphilly Bird & Small Animal Rescue Sanctuary" case is a microcosm** of these larger behavioural patterns. The appropriation of a respected name, the false statements (trademark, fox image, etc.), and the intimidation of detractors all mirror past behaviour – now simply targeted at a different sector (animal welfare instead of baby banks or charities). This suggests that without intervention or increased awareness, similar episodes could recur, possibly causing harm to public donors, animals, or the integrity of community initiatives.

Legal and Public Interest Implications (UK Context)

In the UK, activities described in this report touch on several legal areas and public interest concerns:

- **Trademark Law:** As noted, **trademark rights are not established until registration** (and even then, rights need to be enforced civilly) ¹⁶. Any claims by the new group that others using the name "Caerphilly Bird Rescue" are committing a crime are patently false. If the application UK00004316067 proceeds to registration, Jayne Price would gain a civil remedy to attempt to prevent confusing use in Class 36 (fundraising) by others, but even that could be challenged by prior use defenses or deemed non-applicable if others are not using it commercially. Misstating

trademark law could itself be seen as a **misleading or aggressive business practice**, something regulators frown upon in charity/community contexts.

- **Defamation and Malicious Communications:** The public accusations and name-calling by the operator against individuals (e.g., labeling someone a sex offender or fraud without evidence, as has occurred ⁵³ ⁵⁴) expose her to potential **defamation claims**. UK defamation law is strict; making unfounded allegations publicly can result in legal action if the targeted individual chooses. Additionally, harassing people online with threats can fall foul of laws like the **Malicious Communications Act 1988** or **Protection from Harassment Act 1997**. Ironically, while the operator frequently threatens others with legal consequences, it is her own statements that are legally risky.
- **Charity/CIC Regulations:** Operating a rescue or soliciting donations under potentially false pretenses could attract regulatory action. If Jayne's Baby Bank CIC is using funds for a "sanctuary" that isn't properly established, or making claims that mislead donors, the CIC regulator or Charity Commission (if charity registration is sought) may investigate. The **UK charity sector values transparency and accuracy**; any attempt to pose as a charity when one is not (for example, using a community group to raise money as if it were a registered charity) can be grounds for sanctions. Notably, **Jayne's Baby Bank is not a registered charity** – it is a CIC – and the "sanctuary" is not a registered entity at all ¹³ . Publicly, the operator sometimes blurs these lines, using terminology like "charity" loosely. This has already been flagged by observers: one comment succinctly noted, addressing the operator, "*JBB (aka Carrie Anne Ridsdale)... You are NOT a charity!*" ⁵⁵ .
- **Animal Welfare Law:** Should the new venture actually take possession of animals, it would come under animal welfare legislation and potentially require licensing (especially if operating as a sanctuary or rehomer). Given the history of the original rescue's welfare issues, any new operation claiming to rescue animals will be under a spotlight. **Operating without proper facilities or expertise could lead to animal suffering and legal repercussions**. As of the latest information, there is **no indication the new group has any proper facility or license for animal care** – the promotional content has been aspirational (and at times fabricated, as with the fox). If they do start handling animals, local authorities and the RSPCA would likely need to be vigilant.

From a public interest standpoint, this case highlights how vulnerable communities can be to **misinformation and persona-led ventures**. Many people donate in good faith to causes like animal rescue, and a familiar name like "Caerphilly Bird Rescue" carries weight. A new party co-opting that name can rapidly attract support under false pretenses. The public relies on **regulatory signals (charity numbers, company registrations, etc.)** to gauge legitimacy. In this case, the presence of a trademark application was trumpeted to **masquerade as a mark of legitimacy**, when it is not. It is therefore vital for public awareness that **a trademark or social media page does not equal a legitimate rescue operation**. As one public due-diligence notice aptly put it: "*A pending trade mark is not proof of legitimacy or welfare capability.*" ⁵⁶ Potential donors and volunteers should **verify the legal status** of any new rescue (ask for charity/CIC registration numbers, animal activity licenses, etc.) and look for evidence of real operations before trusting such claims ⁵⁷ ⁵⁸ .

Conclusion & Recommendations

In conclusion, this internal report finds substantial evidence of misrepresentation and misconduct in the situation surrounding "*The New Caerphilly Bird & Small Animal Rescue Sanctuary*". The

attempt to assume the **“Caerphilly Bird Rescue” identity** has been executed via a pending trademark and public declarations, **without authorization from the original founders or proper legal standing**. The new operator, **Jayne Price (Carrie Anne Ridsdale)**, has engaged in a pattern of **misleading behaviour** – from posting a **stolen image with a fabricated story** ²⁴, to making **false claims about law enforcement and legal rights** ¹⁵, to **intimidating critics with baseless threats** ³⁸. Concurrently, the **original Caerphilly Bird Rescue’s stewards have disavowed any connection** and exposed the takeover claims as false ⁵⁹ ²¹. The **trademark dispute** remains ongoing, but it should be clear that **a name registration alone cannot erase or overwrite 33 years of history** nor can it legitimize the new operation’s conduct.

From a risk management perspective, this scenario presents a **high risk of public confusion and harm**. Donors could be misled into funding an unproven venture under the mistaken belief it’s a continuation of a trusted charity. Animals could potentially be placed in care of a group that has not demonstrated compliance or capacity. **Trust in community institutions is undermined** when an entity flouts norms (e.g. using fear of “law” to silence concerned citizens) and attempts to rewrite narratives.

Recommendations: It is advised that relevant oversight bodies (e.g., the CIC Regulator, local Council charity liaison, and animal welfare authorities in Caerphilly) be made aware of these findings. Any public communications by the new venture should be scrutinized for compliance with trading standards (truth in advertising) and charity law. The public should be encouraged to perform due diligence: verify registrations, seek independent references, and approach such new ventures with healthy skepticism. If harassment or intimidation of critics crosses legal lines, police should indeed investigate – not the purported online slander the operator alleges, but rather **whether the operator’s own actions constitute harassment**.

Finally, the **leak of this internal report** is intended to **ensure maximum transparency**. The issues at hand – animal welfare, public donations, and the integrity of charitable work – are squarely in the public interest. By documenting the evidence and timeline (with quotes and records), this report enables the community and stakeholders to be **fully informed**. The hope is that sunlight on these facts will prompt a resolution: either the new venture corrects its course dramatically under public scrutiny, or authorities and informed public pressure will prevent further **misleading of the community**. The legacy of Caerphilly Bird Rescue and the trust of its supporters deserve to be protected from misuse.

Sources:

- IPO Trade Mark Journal entry for **UK00004316067**, 16 Jan 2026, detailing the application “The New Caerphilly Bird and Small Animal Rescue Sanctuary” in Class 36 (Fundraising), filed 26 Dec 2025, owner Jayne Price ⁷ ⁸.
- **CaerphillyBirdAndAnimalRescue.co.uk** – Public disclosure incident log (24 Jan 2026) providing evidence of the fox image post, its deletion, and clarification on the trademark’s legal limits ⁶⁰ ¹⁰.
- **JaynesBabyBank.co.uk** – “*Stolen Fox Image and Misleading Promotion – The New Caerphilly Rescue Claim*” (25 Jan 2026) – archived analysis of the Facebook post incident, including the fabricated narrative and the false “fake page” defense ²⁷ ³⁰.
- **JaynesBabyBank.co.uk** – “*Amendment Update – Statement from the original Caerphilly Bird Rescue operator*” – includes Carol Gravenor’s public statement (late Jan 2026) refuting the takeover, with direct quotes asserting the 33-year history and condemning the new claims ¹ ²¹.
- **BBC News (Wales)** – “*Bird rescuer kept animals in ‘filthy’ conditions*” (12 Jan 2024) – news report on Carol Gravenor’s court case, confirming the lifetime animal ban and context of the original rescue’s closure ³ ⁴.

- **JaynesBabyBank.co.uk** – “*New Incorporation Raises Familiar Questions*” (7 Nov 2025) – investigative report revealing the link between **Jayne Price** and **Carrie-Anne Ridsdale** via corporate filings, and documenting intimidation tactics (false claims about police/regulator actions) used to deter complaints ^{5 38} .
- **Internal analysis comments** from public forums (archived on JaynesBabyBank.co.uk) highlighting patterns: e.g. use of multiple fake accounts, public threats, and reminders that Jayne’s Baby Bank is “*not a charity*” ⁵⁵ .
- **Trade Mark law reference:** Emphasis that trademark infringement is generally a civil matter, not criminal – supported implicitly by standard UK IPO guidelines and explicitly by legal commentary ¹² .

Each of the above sources has been cross-referenced and archived to ensure the accuracy of quotes and factual claims herein. This compiled briefing is intended to support fact-based discourse and **prevent the rewriting of history through unchecked assertions**. All stakeholders are urged to remain evidence-led and to uphold the principles of honesty and accountability in the charitable and rescue domains.

^{1 2 6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 43 44 45}
^{46 47 48 56 57 58 59 60} The New Caerphilly Bird & Small Animal Rescue Sanctuary — incident log & disclosure
<https://caerphillybirdandanimalrescue.co.uk/>

^{3 4} Bird rescuer kept animals in 'filthy' conditions - BBC News
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-67958930>

^{5 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 49 50 54 55} Jayne’s Baby Bank C.I.C. — New Incorporation Raises Familiar Questions - Jayne’s Baby Bank
<https://jaynesbabybank.co.uk/2025/11/07/jaynes-baby-bank-c-i-c-new-incorporation-raises-familiar-questions/>

⁷ Intellectual Property Office - Trade Mark Journal Number 2026/003
<https://www.ipo.gov.uk/tm/t-journal/t-tmj/tm-journals/2026-003/UK00004316067.html>

^{31 32 33 34 51 52 53} From Teacher Claims to B&Q Evidence: What the Deleted Posts Reveal - Jayne’s Baby Bank
<https://jaynesbabybank.co.uk/2026/01/02/from-teacher-claims-to-bq-evidence-what-the-deleted-posts-reveal/>