Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108071

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108071
Time of filing	2025-10-21 10:34:20
Domain names	arcelormitalt.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Elena Gimenez

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 has proved to own the following trademark right, inter alia:

- International trademark ARCELORMITTAL n°947686 registered on August 3, 2007, and duly renewed.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <com> registered on January 27, 2006.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, ArcelorMittal, is a company specialising in steel production, particularly for the automotive, construction, household appliance and packaging industries, with a production of 57.9 million tonnes of crude steel in 2024. It has large stocks of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <arcelormitalt.com> on October 16, 2025.

The Complainant submitted the following documents to prove the abovementioned facts:

- Annex-1: Information regarding the Complainant
- Annex-2: Complainant's trademarks
- Annex-3: Complainant's domain name
- Annex-4: Whois of the disputed domain name
- Annex-5: Website in relation with the disputed domain name

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

Identity (paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <arcelormitalt.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Arcelormittal trademarks.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark, with only a minor misspelling consisting of the displacement of the letter "T" to the end of the term. This alteration is a typical form of typosquatting, deliberately designed to exploit Internet users who mistakenly type an incorrect address when attempting to reach the Complainant's official website. (WIPO Case No. D2020-3457, ArcelorMittal (Société Anonyme) v. Name Redacted <arcelormltal.com>). Thus, the misspelling of the Complainant's trademark does not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusing similar to the Complainant's trademark; on the contrary, such typosquatting practice is designed precisely to exploit that similarity.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks.

Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests (paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy)

The Complainant asserted that the Respondent has never been granted a license, or any other way been authorized, in order to register the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent never sought the consent of the Complainant in order to register the aforementioned domain name. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks any right or legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also claims that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark ARCELORMITTAL. The Panel agrees that typosquatting is occurring, and finds this is additional evidence that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests under Policy 4(a)(ii).

Finally, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide its arguments in support of its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure as it considers appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Rules. In the absence of any submissions from the Respondent, the Panel accepts the Complainant's prima facie case and finds that paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP is therefore fulfilled.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.)

In the light of the records, the Complainant showed the disputed domain name is consequently similar to the well-known ARCELORMITTAL trademark. Arguably, the Respondent registered said domain name knowing that the trademark benefited from a worldwide reputation. Moreover, the time of the registration, namely October 2025, is well posterior to the registration of ARCELORMITTAL trademarks.

Therefore, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent was well aware of the ARCELORMITTAL trademark and has registered the dispute domain name with the intention to refer to the Complainant and to its trademark.

Furthermore, it seems that the Respondent has registered the dispute domain name in bad faith for the sole purpose to attract Internet users, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. Indeed, the Panel finds that the Respondent's misspelling of Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark in the disputed domain name indicates that Respondent is typosquatting which is an indication of bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy 4(a)(iii).

The disputed domain name redirected to an inactive page. The Panel however considers that it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law. As consistently held under the Policy, passive holding does not preclude a finding of bad faith where the surrounding factors point to a bad-faith intent.

To the Panel's opinion, this shows that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arcelormitalt.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Nathalie Dreyfus**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-11-20

Publish the Decision