

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107966

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107966
Time of filing	2025-09-23 09:30:17
Domain names	acelorx.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name Meriel' Peterich

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 registrant of the international trademark registration No. 778212, "ARCELOR", registered on February 25, 2002, for goods and services in classes 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, 37, 40 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on September 13, 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant states that it is the largest steel producing company in the world and that it is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging.

The Complainant adds that it holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

The Complainant points out that it is the owner of the international trademark "ARCELOR", registered before the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that it owns an important domain names portfolio, including the domain name <arcelor.com> registered since

August 29, 2001.

The Complainant considers that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark "ARCELOR", because the slight difference between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark and it does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its trademarks.

The Complainant adds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and it is not related in any way with the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known as the disputed domain name, because it is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name.

The Complainant clarifies that it does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

The Complainant underlines that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark "ARCELOR", or apply for registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name redirects to a "coming soon" page.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent did not make any use of the disputed domain name since its registration and that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use it.

Therefore, the Complainant considers that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant observes that past panels have confirmed the notoriety of the widely known trademark "ARCELOR".

The Complainant points out that, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and the Complainant's reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant underlines that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and considers that it is not possible to conceive any plausible actual or contemplated use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate.

Therefore, the Complainant considers that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name and is using it in bad faith.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant, relying on the arguments summarised above, 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

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name, the Complainant has to demonstrate that:

- (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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The first requirement that the Complainant must establish is that the disputed domain name is identical with, or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark or service mark rights.

There are two elements of this test: the Complainant must demonstrate that it has rights in a trademark or service mark and, if so, the disputed domain name must be shown to be identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark.

The Complainant has proven ownership of the registered trademark "ARCELOR", identified in section "Identification of rights" above.

On the question of identity or confusing similarity, what is required is simply a comparison and assessment of the disputed domain name itself to the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's trademark "ARCELOR" only by the deletion of the first of the two letters "R" and the addition of the letter "X", and of the top-level domain ".COM".

In the present case, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's "ARCELOR" trademark for the following reasons: (a) "ARCELOR" is a distinctive trademark; (b) the only difference, except the top-level domain, between the "ARCELOR" trademark and the disputed domain name is that in the latter the first of the two letters "R" has been deleted and the letter "X" has been added; (c) the fact of deleting the first of the two letters "R" and adding the letter "X" in the disputed domain name does not create any new word, or give the disputed domain name any distinctive meaning; and (d) the above-mentioned minor changes do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

It is also well established that the top-level domain may generally be disregarded in the confusing similarity test (see, for example, WIPO case No. D2016-2547).

Therefore, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark "ARCELOR".

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The second requirement that the Complainant must prove is that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances can be situations in which the respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

- (i) before any notice to [the Respondent] of the dispute, [the Respondent's] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) [the Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) [has] been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [the Respondent] [has] acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) [the Respondent] [is] making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

This is a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent can show rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

The onus of proving this requirement falls on the Complainant. UDRP panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible task of "proving a negative".

Accordingly, it is usually sufficient for a complainant to raise a prima facie case against the respondent and the burden of proof on this requirement shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainant states that:

- the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent;
- neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark "ARCELOR" or apply for registration of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name points to a "coming soon" page.

In the absence of a Response, there is no indication in the present case that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate any of the other non-exclusive circumstances evidencing rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or other evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent does not appear to make any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Indeed, the disputed domain name redirects users to a "coming soon" page.

Taking into account that the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, and that the Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the disputed domain name or to apply for registration of it and that the disputed domain name redirects users to a "coming soon" page, the Panel cannot imagine any possible legitimate justification for this use, and the Respondent has not come forward with any explanation that demonstrates any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

Under the third requirement of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name has been both registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, including:

- (i) circumstances indicating that [the Respondent] [has] registered or [has] acquired the [disputed] domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the [disputed] domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [the Respondent's] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the [disputed] domain name; or
- (ii) [the Respondent] [has] registered the [disputed] domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the Respondent] [has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) [the Respondent] [has] registered the [disputed] domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the Respondent] [has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the Respondent's] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the Respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [the Respondent's] web site or location.

The Panel, on the basis of the evidence presented, agrees with the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and that it has been used in bad faith.

The Panel observes that it is well established that the scenarios described in UDRP paragraph 4(b) are non-exclusive and merely illustrative. Therefore, even where a complainant is not able to demonstrate the literal application of one of the above-mentioned scenarios, evidence demonstrating that a respondent seeks to take unfair advantage of, abuse, or otherwise engage in behaviour detrimental to the complainant's trademark would also satisfy the complainant's burden.

Indeed, taking into account the distinctiveness and reputation of the trademark "ARCELOR", which long predated the disputed domain name, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's rights in the trademark "ARCELOR" when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent should have performed an internet search, aimed at excluding possible conflicts with third party rights. Therefore, the Respondent has failed to carry out such a search and has to be considered responsible for the resulting abusive registration under the concept of wilful blindness (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2018-1182). Consequently, this circumstance is considered by the Panel as evidence of bad faith.

As regards the fact that the disputed domain name points to a "coming soon" page., the Panel, in line with the views of other panels (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2025-2044), in the present circumstances considers that the disputed domain name has not been used for an active website and this non-use (notwithstanding a "coming soon" page) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

The Panel observes that if the Respondent had legitimate purposes in registering and using the disputed domain name it would have

filed a response in this proceeding.

The Panel, having taken into account the Respondent's knowledge of the "ARCELOR" trademark at the time of the disputed domain name's registration, the fact that the disputed domain name points to a "coming soon" page and that no response to the complaint has been filed considers that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of 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. acelorx.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name Michele Antonini

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-19

Publish the Decision