

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-105739

Case number	CAC-UDRP-105739
Time of filing	2023-08-29 08:59:31
Domain names	ancelormittal.com, anceiormittal.com

### Case administrator

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

### Complainant

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

### Complainant representative

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

### Respondent

Name	Omo last
------	----------

#### 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 names.

#### IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations, including the international trademark No. 947686 "ARCELORMITTAL®" registered on August 3, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark").

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is ARCELORMITTAL, a company specialized in steel producing. The Complainant 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 59 million tons crude steel made in 2022.

The Complainant also owns an important domain names portfolio, such as the domain name <ancelormittal.com> registered since January 27, 2006.

The disputed domain names were registered on August 22, 2023 and resolve to inactive pages. However, MX servers seems to be active.

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

##### COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, that it is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, and that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain names by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It contends that the Respondent must have been fully aware of the Complainant and its well-known Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names and that the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain names but also the fact that MX servers have been configured is evidence of bad faith.

##### RESPONDENT:

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

---

#### RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the complainant's trademark; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trademark. The obvious misspelling is indeed a form of typosquatting and the Panel agrees that the slight spelling variations do not prevent a domain name from being confusing similar to the Complainant's trademark.

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The

Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

3.1 The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark as the Trademark is highly distinctive and well-established.

3.2 Furthermore, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain names have been used in bad faith under the principles of passive holding. It is the consensus view that the lack of active use of a domain name does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. In such cases, the panel must examine all the circumstances of the case to determine whether a respondent is acting in bad faith. Examples of circumstances that can indicate bad faith include a complainant having a well-known trademark, no response to the complaint, respondent's concealment of identity and the impossibility of conceiving a good faith use of the domain name (cf *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; *Jupiters Limited v. Aaron Hall*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0574; *Ladbroke Group Plc v. Sonoma International LDC*, WIPO Case No. D2002-0131).

The Panel is convinced that the Trademark is highly distinctive and well-established. Furthermore, the Respondent failed to file a Response and therefore did not provide evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain names. In the view of the Panel, the facts of this case do not allow for any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain names by the Respondent in good faith. The Panel is therefore convinced that, even though the disputed domain names have not yet been actively used, the Respondent's non-use of the disputed domain names equals to use in bad faith.

---

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

---

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

1. **ancelormittal.com**: Transferred
2. **anceiormittal.com**: Transferred

---

## PANELLISTS

Name	<b>Stefanie Efstathiou LL.M. mult.</b>
------	----------------------------------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2023-09-25**

Publish the Decision

---