Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108168

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108168
Time of filing	2025-11-20 10:11:58
Domain names	arcelormittal-br.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	patircio ffc

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 holder of the international word mark ARCELORMITTAL registered under No. 947686 since August 3, 2007, covering goods and services in classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41 and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, ARCELORMITTAL, is a company specialized in the production of steel. The Complainant is the largest steel producing company in the world with 57.9 million tons crude steel made in 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of the registered international word mark ARCELORMITTAL in several classes since 2007, and also owns domain names such as <arcelormittal.com>.

The disputed domain name <arcelormittal-br.com> has been registered on November 17, 2025, and does not appear to resolve to an active website.

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

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in Paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

Thus, for the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

1. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
3. The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has therefore dealt with each of these requirements in turn.

1. Identity of confusing similarity

The Complainant must first establish that there is a trademark or service mark in which it has rights. Since the Complainant is the holder of the registered ARCELORMITTAL trademark, which is used in connection with the Complainant's steel production business, it is established that there is a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name <arcelormittal-br.com> incorporates the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark in its entirety, merely adding a hyphen and the letters "b" and "r". In the Panel's view, these additions do not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name (see section 1.8 WIPO Overview 3.0; IM PRODUCTION v. Xue Han, CAC Case No. 104877 <isabel-marantus.com>).

Additionally, it is well established that the Top Level Domains ("TLDs") such as ".com" may be disregarded when considering

whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights (see section 1.11 WIPO Overview 3.0).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the Complainant has made out the first of the three elements that it must establish.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

It is established case law that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent (see section 2.1 WIPO Overview 3.0 and Champion Innovations, Ltd. V. Udo Dussling (45FHH), WIPO case No. D2005-1094; Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., WIPO case No. D2003-0455; Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o., WIPO case No. 2004-0110).

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has not acquired trademark or service mark rights. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is known as "patircio ffc". The Respondent's use and registration of the disputed domain name was not authorized by the Complainant. There are no indications that a connection between the Complainant and the Respondent existed.

Fundamentally, a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry. Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner (see section 2.5.1 WIPO Overview 3.0). The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant'sARCELORMITTAL trademark in its entirety, merely adding a hyphen and the letters "br". In the Panel's view, this combination even increases the risk of confusion with the Complainant as "br" is the country code for Brazil. The disputed domain name can therefore easily be considered as referring to activities the Complainant would have in Brazil. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute fair use.

The Panel observes that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. In the Panel's view, this does not amount to any legitimate noncommercial or fair use or use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In light of the above, the Complainant succeeds on the second element of the Policy.

3. Bad faith

Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and that it is being used in bad faith (see section 4.2 WIPO Overview 3.0 and e.g. Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallow, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; Control Techniques Limited v. Lektronix Ltd, WIPO Case No. D2006-1052).

According to the Panel, the awareness of a respondent of the complainant and/or the complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration can evidence bad faith (see Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz, WIPO Case No. D2011-2209; Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite, WIPO Case No. D2001-1070).

In the instant case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the ARCELORMITTAL trademark at the moment it registered the disputed domain name, since the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive and well-known ARCELORMITTAL trademark in its entirety and adds a term which could be considered to refer to a location of the Complainant's activities. Moreover, the Complainant's mark has been registered more than 15 years before the disputed domain name. Finally, the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark have been confirmed by several UDRP panels (see e.g. ARCELORMITTAL v. China Capital, CAC Case No. 101908, ARCELORMITTAL v. Robert Rudd, CAC Case No. 101667).

Given the totality of the circumstances discussed above, the fact that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding (see section 3.3, WIPO Overview 3.0).

Finally, the Respondent did not formally take part in the administrative proceedings. According to the Panel, this serves as an additional indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, it is sufficiently shown that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

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

PANELLISTS

Name	**Flip Petillion**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-12-23

Publish the Decision