Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107884

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107884
Time of filing	2025-08-25 09:10:06
Domain names	armittalmexico.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Marco antonio gonzalez valdez

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 1198046 MITTAL registered on December 5, 2013 in classes 6 and 40, and being in effect.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the world largest steel manufacturing company and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging with over 57 million of steel made in 2024.

The disputed domain name <armittalmexico.com> was registered on August 21, 2025 and resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant´s logo on top of it and content relating to steel in the following.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <armittalmexico.com> is confusingly similar to Complainant´s

trademark „Mittal“ despite the additional element „Mexico“ and the letters „AR“, since it is well-established that a domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant’s registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

Given the Complainant's trademark widely known, Complainant finally contends that the Respondent has registered and used the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the disputed domain name redirects to a website reproducing the Complainant’s logo. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is attempting to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and the unauthorized e-mail address.

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 “Mittal.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant´s mark since the addition of geographical indication „Mexico“ as well as the two letter „AR“ representing the first two letters of Complainant´s name do not have a relevant influence on the similarity of signs, since geographical indications are not distinctive and Complainant´s trademark is fully incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademark „Mittal“ 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 “armittalmexico.com“ 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 similar to a distinctive trademark as the one from Complainant, and the website to which the disputed domain name is connected being referencing Complainant´s logo and website 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.

These circumstances 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. **armittalmexico.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dietrich Beier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-09-26

Publish the Decision