

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107725

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107725
Time of filing	2025-07-04 10:03:34
Domain names	accelorconstructions.com

### Case administrator

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

### Complainant

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

### Complainant representative

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

### Respondent

Organization	Accelor Constructions
--------------	-----------------------

#### 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 owns international trade mark registration No 778212 ARCELOR, first registered on 25 February 2002 in international classes 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, 37, 40 and 42. The Complainant's trade mark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant owns a portfolio of domain names including and consisting of the name ARCELOR, including the domain <arcelor.com>, registered on 29 August 2001.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is one of the largest steel producing companies in the world and is a market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging with some 57.9 million tons of crude steel made in 2024. It operates extensive distribution networks. The disputed domain name was registered on 30 June 2025 and resolves to an inactive parking page.

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that all three elements of the UDRP have been fulfilled and it therefore requests the transfer of the

disputed domain name to the Complainant. 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 trade mark 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

With regard to the first UDRP element, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with the Complainant's trade mark ARCELOR. Indeed, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark in its entirety, save that the disputed domain name substitutes the first letter "R" of the Complainant's trade mark with a letter "C" and adds the generic descriptive term "constructions" as suffix to the Complainant's trade mark. The Panel considers the present case to be a case of "typosquatting", i.e., the disputed domain name contains an obvious and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trade mark, which is not sufficient to alter the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trade mark. Minor alterations to the Complainant's trade mark do not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, its trade mark and associated domain name. The Panel follows in this respect the view established by numerous other decisions that a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trade mark is to be considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant trade mark (see, for example, CAC Case No. 103124, Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG v. Fundacion Comercio Electronico <boehringeringelheimpetreebates.com>; CAC Case No. 101990, JCDECAUX SA v. Emma Purnell <jcdeceux.com>; CAC Case No. 101892, JCDECAUX SA v. Lab-Clean Inc <jcdacaux.com>; WIPO Case No. D2005-0941, Bayerische Motoren Werke AG, Sauber Motorsport AG v. Petaluma Auto Works <bmwsauberf1.com>; WIPO Case No. D2015-1679, LinkedIn Corporation v. Daphne Reynolds <linkedlnjobs.com>; CAC Case No. 103960, SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE v. Michele Swanson <schnaider-electric.com> ("the obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark SCHNAIDER ELECTRIC instead of SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC is a clear evidence of "typosquatting"); and CAC Case No. 103166, BOURSORAMA SA v. Cloud DNS Ltd <recover-boursorama.link> ("A domain name that contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark and uses a common name, obvious or intentional misspelling of that mark is considered by UDRP panels to be similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element (see paragraph 1.9 WIPO Overview 3.0)"). With regard to the addition of the generic descriptive term "constructions" to the disputed domain name, the Panel follows the view established by numerous other decisions that a domain name which wholly incorporates a complainant's registered trade mark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for the purposes of the UDRP (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasiliy Terkin <porsche-autoparts.com>). The Panel further considers it to be well established that the addition of a descriptive term does not allow a domain name to avoid confusing similarity with a trade mark (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2019-2294, Qantas Airways Limited v. Quality Ads <qantaslink.com>; and CAC Case No. 102137, Novartis AG v. Black Roses <novartiscorp.com>). Other panels have previously found that "[W]here the relevant trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element" (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8; and, for example, WIPO Case No. D2023-2542, Merryvale Limited v. tao tao <wwbetway.com>; and WIPO Case No. D2020-0528, Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Rich Ardetea <global-iqos.com>). Against this background, the Panel finds that the addition of the generic descriptive term "constructions" is not sufficient to alter the overall impression of the designations as being connected with the Complainant's trade mark and does not prevent a likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, its trade mark and associated domain name. To the contrary, the disputed domain name rather adds to the likelihood of confusion because the addition of the descriptive term "constructions", in conjunction with the Complainant's trade mark ARCELOR, may be taken to suggest that the disputed domain name links to business

of the Complainant's subsidiary Arcelor Construction and to imply that it is linked to the Complainant and/or its subsidiary and business.

With regard to the second UDRP element, there is no evidence before the Panel to suggest that the Respondent has made any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Neither is there any indication that the Respondent is making legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Indeed, the disputed domain name is not being used for any active website but resolve to an inactive parking page. A lack of content at the disputed domain has in itself been regarded by other panels as supporting a finding that the respondent lacked a bona fide offering of goods or services and did not make legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 1773444, Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc v. Joannet Macket/JM Consultants). The Panel further finds that the Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant in any way and is neither licensed nor otherwise authorised to make any use of the Complainant's trade mark or to apply for or use the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Whois information for the disputed domain name does not suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name <accelorconstructions.com>. Past panels have held that a respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name, as is equally not the case here (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> ("Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as "Chad Moston / Elite Media Group." The Panel therefore finds under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii).").

Finally, as noted above, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trade mark; the Panel follows the view expressed in other decisions that typosquatting can evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name (see, for example, Forum Case No. 1597465, The Hackett Group, Inc. v. Brian Hens / The Hackett Group <thehackettgroups.com> ("The Panel agrees that typosquatting is occurring, and finds this is additional evidence that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests under Policy ¶ 4(a)(ii)."). Against this background, and absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. With regard to the third UDRP element, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent either knew, or should have known, that the disputed domain name would be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark, and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in full knowledge of the Complainant's trade mark. Indeed, if the Respondent had carried out a Google search for the term "accelorconstructions", the search results would have yielded obvious results related to the Complainant, its websites, and its connected businesses and services. Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive parking page.

The Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name.

First, it is difficult to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate on the grounds that it would constitute passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trade mark law under circumstances where the disputed domain name corresponds to the Complainant's trade mark and is similar to the Complainant's genuine domain name currently used by the latter to promote its goods and services.

Secondly, numerous other UDRP decisions have taken the view, which this Panel shares, that the passive holding of a domain name with knowledge that the domain name infringes another party's trade mark rights may in itself be regarded as evidence of bad faith registration and use (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows; and WIPO Case No. D2004-0615, Comerica Inc. v. Horoshiy, Inc.).

Absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel therefore also accepts that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

---

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

**Accepted**

---

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

1. **accelorconstructions.com**: Transferred
- 

## PANELLISTS

Name	Gregor Kleinknecht LLM MCI Arb
------	--------------------------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-07-31

---

Publish the Decision

---