

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-104374

Case number CAC-UDRP-104374

Time of filing 2022-02-24 08:47:26

Domain names arcelormittalsa.com

### Case administrator

Organization Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

### Complainant

Organization ARCELORMITTAL (SA)

### Complainant representative

Organization NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

### Respondent

Name HILDA NAKATO

#### OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

#### IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of the international registration 947686 ARCELORMITTAL registered on August 3, 2007.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the world largest steel manufacturing company with 168000 employees in 2020 and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging.

The disputed domain name <arcelormittalsa.com> was registered on February 17, 2022 and resolves to a parking page with commercial links to third parties.

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

#### RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to

a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

---

#### NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

---

#### BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

---

#### PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

---

#### PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

In order to succeed in its claim, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

(i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

(iii) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

#### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for "ARCELORMITTAL".

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark since on the one hand the duplication of one letter "L" does not change neither the oral nor the optical similarity and on the other hand the further element SA, which is the usual abbreviation of "Société anonyme", the legal form of complainant, at the end of the domain name is descriptive and of no distinctiveness.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademark "ARCELORMITTAL" in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

#### B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks or designations confusingly similar to its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "ARCELORMITTAL" or that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

#### C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel does not believe that the application of a domain name being highly similar to a distinctive trademark as the one

from Complainant, even with the addition of the legal form of the Complainant, is accidental.

This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular domain name without the Complainant's authorization.

The circumstances of this case, in particular the commercial advertising links to third parties furthermore indicate that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name primarily with the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its potential website or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or location, or of a product or service on such website or location. The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

---

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

---

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **ARCELORMITTALLSA.COM**: Transferred

---

## PANELLISTS

Name	Dietrich Beier
------	----------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2022-03-31

---

Publish the Decision

---