Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107938

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107938
Time of filing	2025-09-11 07:39:24
Domain names	atendimentoarcelormittal.online

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	joao donizete

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

Arcelormittal S.A. (the “Complainant”) is the owner of the international trademark (Reg. No. 947686) ARCELORMITTAL, registered on August 3, 2007 (Nice classes 6, 12, 21, 40).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the largest steel producing company in the world and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging with 57,9 million tons crude steel made in 2024.

The Complainant owns domain name composed of its trademark, namely <arcelormittal.com> (registered since January 27, 2006).

Previous UDRP Panels have acknowledged that ARCELORMITTAL trademark is well-known (eg. 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."; CAC Case No. 101667, ARCELORMITTAL v. Robert Rudd ("The Panel is convinced that the Trademark is highly distinctive and well-established.").

The disputed domain name <atendimentoarcelormittal.online> was registered on September 8, 2025 and resolves to a parking page.

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 Panel agrees with the Complainant that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark ARCELORMITTAL. The Complainant’s trademark is included in its entirety. The addition of the Portuguese generic term “atendimento” (“customer service” in English) is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant’s trademark. On the contrary, the mark composed with the reference to the customer service may only strengthen the impression that this mark is linked with the Complainant. Lastly, the addition of the generic TLD <.online> does not impact this conclusion: “the applicable Top Level Domain (“TDL”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusion similarity test” (see WIPO Overview 3.0, §1.11.1).

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant presented prima facie evidence that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted Respondent to use Complainant’s trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent's name does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

As no administratively compliant response has been provided to the Panel and the prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the Respondent meant Complainant's trademark ARCELORMITTAL when he/she registered the disputed domain name <atendimentoarcelormittal.online> (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.1.1). Previous UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name points to a parking page. This means the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users to his own website by taking advantage of the Complainant’s trademarks for commercial gain, which constitutes evidence of bad faith use (see para. 4(b)(iv) of the Policy). Previous panels have also held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith, namely, sending e-mail, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.4).

The Panel is, therefore, convinced that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **atendimentoarcelormittal.online**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Darius Sauliūnas**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-12

Publish the Decision