Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107900

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107900
Time of filing	2025-08-28 09:28:22
Domain names	arcelormiittalbrasil.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Pedro Henrique Queiroz

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 the International trademark number 947686 for ARCELORMITTAL, which was registered on 3 August 2007.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is one of the largest steel producing company in the world and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging. It has an extensive distribution network.

The Complainant’s trademark registration for ARCELORMITTAL predates the registration of the disputed domain name. Its domain names portfolio includes the domain name <arcelormittal.com>, registered since 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on 25 August 2025 and has been registered to the Respondent since at least 27 August 2025. It resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant’s logo.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements:

i. the disputed domain is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

A. IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Complainant's trademark registration ARCELORMITTAL predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark ARCELORMITTAL and claims that adding the letter "i" to ARCELORMITTAL and the term "brasil" is not sufficient to escape the finding that in the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant's distinctive trademark is clearly recognisable in the disputed domain name. The Panel agrees that the adding an "i" in ARCELORMITTAL and the word "brasil", which appears to be a misspelling of the country "Brazil", does nothing to avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

The Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy have been met.

B. NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the mark, ARCELORMITTAL, and has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. The burden of proof now shifts to the Respondent to show that he has relevant rights.

The Respondent has not filed a Response, nor challenged any of the Complainant's assertions. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known as the disputed domain name or has any relevant rights or legitimate interest. The Complainant

has not authorised the Respondent to use its trademark nor register the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduced the Complainant's logo.

Considering these factors, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy have been met.

C. REGISTERED AND BEING USED IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant's distinctive trademark, ARCELORMITTAL, is widely used and predates the registration of the disputed domain name by many years. The disputed domain name resolves to a website naming ARCELORMITTAL and reproducing the Complainant's logo.

The Respondent used a privacy service to register the disputed domain name, has failed to file a Response, and has provided no evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use.

The website linked to the disputed domain name refers to ARCELORMITTAL and includes the Complainant's logo. It appears that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name and registered and has used it in bad faith intending to confuse internet users into thinking that the Respondent is in some way connected to the Complainant and its trademark.

The Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was both registered and used in bad faith and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been met.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arcelormiittalbrasil.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Veronica Bailey**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-02

Publish the Decision