Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107952

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107952
Time of filing	2025-09-16 10:01:10
Domain names	ferromittal.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Mittal Ferro

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

For the Complainant

The Complainant Enjoys Registered Trademark Rights

The Complainant has acquired and enjoys registered trademark rights with respect to its trademarks "MITTAL" and "MITTAL STEEL" in various jurisdictions. such as the European trademark MITTAL STEEL n°004233301 registered since March 27, 2006 and the international trademark n° 1198046 MITTAL registered on December 5, 2013

The Complainant's representative trademark registration information is as follows:

For the Respondent

No evidence is submitted to this Panel about whether the Respondent has trademark rights.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

For the Complainant

The Complainant, ArcelorMittal, is the largest steel-producing company in the world and is a market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances, and packaging. The Complainant holds a substantial portfolio of trademarks containing the term "MITTAL" and operates an extensive distribution network.

For the Respondent

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name <ferromittal.com> on 10 September 2025. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website offering steel materials, directly competing with the Complainant's business.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant

The Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its "MITTAL" trademarks, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety with the addition of the term "ferro" (meaning "steel" in Portuguese) and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com".

The Complainant alleges that it has made out an initial prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized to use the MITTAL mark. Furthermore, the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to host a website offering competing steel products is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that its MITTAL mark is well-known, and the Respondent, operating in the same industry, must have been aware of it. The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to redirect users to a competing website and its identification as "Arcelormittal" on a linked WhatsApp page demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

The Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a Response concerning the Complaint within the required period.

RIGHTS

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove **each of** the following:

1) that the domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

2) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

3) that the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. A) Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant enjoys registered trademark rights concerning the marks "MITTAL" and "MITTAL STEEL". Past UDRP decisions have recognized the notoriety of the Complainant's MITTAL mark.

The Disputed Domain Name <ferromittal.com> incorporates the Complainant's "MITTAL" trademark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive term "ferro" (steel) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity; on the contrary, it reinforces the connection to the Complainant's core business. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is typically disregarded for the purpose of this test.

- WIPO Case No. DMX2018-0040, Arcelormittal (SA) v. Registration Private / david lopez

<aceromittal.mx>;

- CAC Case No. 102294, ArcelorMittal (SA) v. ANKIT ENTERPRISES <mittalmetal.com>, <mittal-metals.com>, <mittalmetalsltd.com>;
- CAC Case No. 102186, ArcelorMittal (SA) v. david lopez <aceromittal.com>.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, in which the Complainant has rights, including:

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has asserted that the Respondent lacks any license, authorization, or affiliation to use the MITTAL mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, and the provided WHOIS information ("Mittal Ferro") appears designed to create a false association with the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to direct users to a website offering competing steel products is not a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent has failed to provide any evidence to rebut this case or demonstrate any such rights or interests.

BAD FAITH

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the complainant to prove both registration and use in bad faith. Nonetheless, Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out particular scenarios, which shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. They are:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or the respondent has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the 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 domain name; or

(ii) the respondent has registered the 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 domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website 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 website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's website or location.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's uncontested evidence, supported by prior UDRP decisions (e.g., WIPO Case No. D2018-1086, WIPO Case No. D2010-2049), that the "MITTAL" trademark is well-known in the global steel industry. The Complainant, being the world's largest steel producer, enjoys a significant reputation. In such cases, panels have consistently held that respondents are deemed to have constructive knowledge of a complainant's rights, even without direct evidence of intent.

The Respondent's registration of a domain name containing this distinctive and famous mark, combined with the term "ferro" (the Portuguese word for "steel," the Complainant's core product), is so logically connected to the Complainant's business that it cannot be seen as a coincidence. In the absence of any evidence of the Respondent's rights to the Disputed Domain Name, the only reasonable inference is that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its well-known MITTAL mark, specifically to target its goodwill.

The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name confirms bad faith. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to an active website offering steel materials, placing the Respondent in **direct competition** with the Complainant. Using a domain name confusingly similar to a well-known competitor's mark to offer competing goods is a classic indicator of bad faith, as it inherently seeks to disrupt the competitor's business and divert its customers.

Evidence further shows that the Respondent identifies itself as "Arcelormittal" on a linked WhatsApp page, intentionally creating confusion as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of its website. This act substantiates that the Respondent's purpose is to create a false association with the Complainant to deceive consumers and gain an illegitimate commercial advantage.

This pattern of behavior squarely fits the scenario described in Policy Paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent, with full knowledge of the Complainant's well-known marks, registered the Disputed Domain Name to exploit the Complainant's goodwill. The Respondent's subsequent use—operating a competing website while actively misrepresenting itself as the Complainant—constitutes a clear and compelling case of bad faith registration and use under the UDRP Policy.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements required under Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. The Panel therefore concludes that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the marks in which the Complainant has rights, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, and that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, pursuant to Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy, the Panel orders that the registration of the disputed domain name **<**ferromittal.com**>** be transferred to the Complainant.

Dennis Cai Weiping

Sole Panelist

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **ferromittal.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dennis Weiping CAI**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-29

Publish the Decision