Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107831

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107831
Time of filing	2025-08-07 09:42:53
Domain names	dsarcelormital.online

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Michael Douglas

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 trademark registration no. 778212 "ARCELOR", which was registered on 25 February 2002 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, recognized as the world's largest steel-producing company and a market leader in steel applications for automotive, construction, household appliances, and packaging, reported a production of 57.9 million tons of crude steel in 2024. The company has substantial captive raw material supplies and operates extensive distribution networks. Information about the Complainant's products and services is available online at <arcelormittal.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on 4 August 2025 and resolves to a website offering steel under the name „ARCELORMITTAL“.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant:

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark. According to the Complainant, the addition of the terms "MITAL“ (a typosquatting of the term „MITTAL“, in reference to the Complainant’s name) and and „DS“ is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant points out that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name, that the Respondent is not related in any way with the Complainant, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, 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 name by the Complainant, and that the disputed domain name resolves to a website selling steel, which competes with the Complainant’s products and activities and is not a use indicative of rights or legitimate interests.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent makes direct references to them on its website and therefore registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Trademark. Regarding bad faith use, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to promote competing products under the Complainant’s name, using the Complainant’s logo, thereby disrupting the Complainant’s business in bad faith. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent’s website or location, as mentioned in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Respondent:

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and

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

1.

The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark. The use of the term “ARCELORMITAL” is a clear case of the typosquatting, as the disputed domain , which merely lacks the letter 'T', is clearly still a reference to the Trademark and the Complainant’s name. The addition of the letters “DS” does not render the disputed domain name sufficiently different from the Trademark, which is still recognisable within it.

2.

The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has not contested these assertions in any manner and, therefore, has failed to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Based on the evidence on file, the Panel cannot find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent either. Using the disputed domain name to run a website that sells competing products does not indicate any rights or legitimate interests. In fact, the use of the Complainant's orange logo and name suggests that the Respondent is attempting to imitate the Complainant.

3.

The Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark, given that the Respondent makes direct reference to the Complainant on its website.

Regarding bad faith use, by utilizing the disputed domain name for a website offering products in direct competition with the Complainant, the Respondent was, in all likelihood, trying to divert traffic intended for the Complainant’s website to its own for commercial gain as set out under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **dsarcelormital.online**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Peter Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-09-12

Publish the Decision