Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107986

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107986
Time of filing	2025-09-23 12:13:30
Domain names	mittalbrasiil.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 is the owner of several trademarks comprising the word MITTAL, registered for a wide range of goods and services in numerous jurisdictions. These include, for example, International trademark No. 1198046 registered on 5 December 2013, European Union trademark No. 3975786 registered on 1 December 2005, and European Union trademark No. 4507471 registered on 7 August 2006. The Complainant also owns a portfolio of domain names incorporating its mark, including mittal-steel.com registered on 18 May 2009.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the world's largest steel producing company, a market leader in steel for automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging, with significant operations and distribution networks globally, including in Brazil. The Complainant asserts extensive reputation and goodwill in the MITTAL mark.

The disputed domain name <mittalbrasiil.com> was registered on 16 September 2025. The Complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page and that MX servers are configured for the disputed domain name.

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

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has established registered rights in the MITTAL trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the MITTAL trademark in its entirety as the leading and distinctive element. The additional term “brasiil” is a misspelling of “Brazil,” a well-known geographic term that directly relates to a country where the Complainant operates extensively. The addition of a descriptive or geographic term— or a misspelling thereof — to a complainant’s recognizable trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The generic Top-Level Domain extension “.com” is typically disregarded for the purpose of the confusing similarity test. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s MITTAL trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not authorized in any way to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark, including in the disputed domain name. In addition, there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent aims at making Internet users believe that the disputed domain name is linked to, or operated by, the Complainant.

The Complainant further demonstrates that the website that is operated under the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page from the Registrar, and there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use. The nature of the disputed domain name, combining the Complainant’s mark with a misspelling of a geographic reference closely associated with the Complainant’s operations, carries a high risk of implied affiliation and does not support a claim of rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the Respondent has not made legitimate use of the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. In lack of any Response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning

of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. The disputed domain name is registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant's MITTAL mark is distinctive and has been recognized in prior UDRP decisions as well known. The composition of the disputed domain name — wholly incorporating MITTAL with a misspelled geographic term referring to a country where the Complainant is active — supports the inference that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and targeted its mark at registration.

The disputed domain name resolves to a registrar parking page. Panels have consistently held that the incorporation of a well-known mark in a domain name, coupled with passive holding or a parked page with links, may evidence bad faith, particularly where no plausible good-faith use is apparent. The configuration of MX servers further heightens the risk that the disputed domain name could be used to send deceptive emails impersonating the Complainant, which panels have viewed as a strong indicator of bad faith.

In lack of any Response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **mittalbrasiil.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Tom Heremans**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-22

Publish the Decision