

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-104914

Case number	CAC-UDRP-104914
Time of filing	2022-10-12 09:33:09
Domain names	mittalinternational.com

Case administrator

Organization	Denisa Bilík (CAC) (Case admin)
--------------	---------------------------------

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL
--------------	---------------

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.
--------------	-------------------

Respondent

Organization	zhong guo heng da ji tuan
--------------	---------------------------

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 has evidenced to be the owner of the following trademark registration:

- Word mark MITTAL, International Registration (World Intellectual Property Organization), registration No.: 1198046, registration date: December 5, 2013, status: active.

Also, the Complainant has substantiated to own various domain names relating to its MITTAL trademark, e.g. <mittal-steel.com> which redirects to the Complainant's main website at "www.arcelormittal.com", used to promote the Complainant's products and related services in the steel industry.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a company specialized in steel producing in the world. The Complainant claims it is the largest steel producing company in the world and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging with operations in more than 60 countries. It holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name <mittalinternational.com> is confusingly similar to its trademark MITTAL®, as it includes the trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name <mittalinternational.com > and he is not related in any way with the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

The Complainant claims that given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name is inactive which is, according to the Complaint, evidence of bad faith use.

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

First, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <mittalinternational.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MITTAL trademark, as it incorporates the latter trademark in its entirety, simply added by the term "international". Numerous UDRP panels have recognized that incorporating a trademark in its entirety can be sufficient to establish that the disputed domain name is at least confusingly similar to a registered trademark. Moreover, it has also been held in many UDRP decisions and has meanwhile become a consensus view among UDRP panels that the mere addition of descriptive or other terms, such as e.g. the term "international", is not capable to dispel the confusing similarity arising from such entire incorporation of the Complainant's MITTAL trademark in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Complainant has established the first element under the Policy as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(i).

Second, the Complainant contends, and the Respondent has not objected to these contentions, that the Respondent has neither made use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent commonly known under the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain. The Respondent has not been authorized to use the Complainant's MITTAL trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that the Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name and the Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the term "Mittal" on its own. Finally, the Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain name does not connect to any relevant content on the Internet, but is passively held instead. Many UDRP panels, however, have recognized that the mere registration of a domain name, even one that is comprised of a confirmed dictionary word or phrase, may not of itself confer rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that, therefore, the Complainant has also satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) and, thus, the second element of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel holds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith. There is a consensus view among UDRP panelists that a passive holding of a disputed domain name may, in appropriate circumstances, be consistent with the finding of bad faith, in particular in circumstances in which, for example, a complainant's trademark is well-known, and there is no conceivable use that could be made of the disputed domain name and would not amount to an infringement of the complainant's trademark's rights. In the case at hand, in the absence of any other reasonable explanation as to why the Respondent should rely on the disputed domain name which includes the Complainant's undisputedly widely known trademark MITTAL, and given that the Respondent has brought forward nothing in substance relating to the intended use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and is making use of the disputed domain name in a manner which at least takes unjustified and unfair advantage of the Complainant's MITTAL trademark's reputation and must, therefore, be considered as registered and being used in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

Therefore, the Complainant has also satisfied the third element under the Policy as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(iii).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. mittalinternational.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Stephanie Hartung
-------------	--------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2022-11-14**

Publish the Decision
