# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107902

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-107902 |
| Time of filing | 2025-08-29 09:46:57 |
| Domain names | pedidosarcelormital.online |

## Case administrator

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Olga Slanařová (Case admin) |

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | ARCELORMITTAL |

## Complainant representative

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

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Reges Delevatti |

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 relies on its rights as the owner and registered proprietor of the international trademark No. 947686, ARCELORMITTAL, registered on 3 August 2007 and designated in over 45 countries in classes 06, 07, 09, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41 and 42. The Complainant also relies on the extensive use of the mark internationally, which makes ARCELORMITTAL a well-known mark within the meaning of the UDRP ("the Policy"). Additionally, the Complainant owns a large domain name portfolio, including <arcelormittal.com> registered on 27 January 2006.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, ARCELORMITTAL, is the largest steel producing company in the world and the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging, producing 57.9 million tons of crude steel in 2024. It holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

The disputed domain name, <pedidosarcelormital.online>, was registered on 26 August 2025 and resolves to a website.

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

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, demonstrated that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy). The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's mark ARCELORMITTAL, subject only to the omission of one letter ('T') and the addition of the term 'pedidos,' a common Spanish and Portuguese term meaning 'orders.' Such minor changes do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

A domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant's registered trademark risks impersonation and may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy, see WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasiliy Terkin. The gTLD '.online' is disregarded for this limb of the Policy.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

The Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name, but as "Reges Delevatti" from Brasil. 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. Thus, the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name, see the 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>

The Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, nor has the Complainant authorized or licensed the Respondent to use its mark. The website associated with the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's logo, creating a false impression of association or endorsement. See WIPO Case No. D2001-0211, Houghton Mifflin Co. v. The Weathermen, Inc and WIPO Case No. D2021-0385, Virgin Enterprises Limited v. Safaa Al Shams Technical Services LLC. Such deliberate use of the Intellectual Property of another for commercial gain cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy). Given the distinctive and well-known character of the ARCELORMITTAL mark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights.

Past panels have found the Complainant's mark is well-known, see CAC Case No. 101908, ARCELORMITTAL v. China Capital ("The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark "ArcelorMittal", at least since 2007. The Complainant's trademark was registered prior to the registration of the disputed domain name (February 7, 2018) and is widely well-known.") and CAC Case

No. 101667, ARCELORMITTAL v. Robert Rudd.

The fact that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduces the Complainant's logo demonstrates an intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the website. This is free-riding, and it is in bad faith.

The Respondent has not come forward to explain or justify the selection and use.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that this constitutes bad faith registration and use.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **pedidosarcelormital.online**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Victoria McEvedy** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-07

Publish the Decision