Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108020

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108020
Time of filing	2025-10-03 08:53:40
Domain names	mex-arcelormittal.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	jaqueline garcia arrollo

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 owns several trademark registrations across various jurisdictions, inter alia the international trademark No. 947686 "ARCELORMITTAL", registered on August 3, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is ARCELORMITTAL (S.A.), a company specialized in steel producing. It is the largest steel producing company in the world and the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging.

The Complainant provides information on its services online at <arcelormittal.com>.

The disputed domain name <mex-arcelormittal.com> was registered on September 28, 2025 and resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's website. In addition, MX servers are configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, that it is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, and that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant. In addition, the Complainant contents that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name by way of displaying the Complainant's logo and impersonating them in, cannot constitute any bona fide offer of services or a legitimate use.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It contends that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, since the Trademark is well-known and Respondent impersonates the Complainant, and that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name and the setting up of MX servers is evidence of bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; 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.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark. The disputed domain name fully incorporates the Trademark, next to the addition of the term "MEX". The Panel agrees that the addition of the term “MEX” can be seen as a short version for the geographical indication for “MEXICO” and is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark.

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The

Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

3.1 The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark as the Trademark is highly distinctive and well-known.

3.2 Furthermore, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

By using the Complainant's logo and impersonating the Complainant on the resolving website under the disputed domain name, it is obvious that the Respondent is targeting the Complainant and is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial purposes, internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website. Furthermore, the Panel accepts that the evidence of active MX records connected to the disputed domain name, lead to the finding of bad faith use, since - in the present case - it is inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **mex-arcelormittal.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Stefanie Efstathiou LL.M. mult.**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-11-10

Publish the Decision