Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108198

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108198
Time of filing	2025-12-03 09:20:16
Domain names	arccelorrnittal.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Andrew Gate

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 (the "Domain Name").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of international trade mark n° 947686 for the standard character mark for "ArcelorMittal" registered on 3 August 2007 in classes 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41 and 42, in reliance upon an earlier Benelux trade mark registration. This international mark has proceeded to grant either in full or in at least some respects, in over 40 jurisdictions.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT

The Complainant is the largest steel producing company in the world and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging with 57.9 million tons crude steel made in 2024. It holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

In addition to its trade mark, the Complainant holds a portfolio of domain names, which includes the domain name <arcelormittal.com> registered since 27 January 2006.

The Domain Name was registered on 27 November 2025. The Domain Name has since registration resolved to a parking page

generated by the Registrar of the Domain Name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the 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 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 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 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

The Panel accepts that this is a clear and obvious case of typosquatting. The only sensible reading of the Domain Name is as a misspelling of the Complainant's name and trade mark with an additional letter “c” and the letter “m” replaced by the letters “rn”, combined with the “.com” top Level Domain (“TLD”).

It follows from this that the Complainant's mark is clearly recognisable in the Domain Name and that the Complainant thereby holds a mark that is "confusingly similar" to the Domain Name as that term is understood under the Policy. In this respect see section 1.7 and 1.9 the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (the “WIPO Overview 3.0”). The Complainant has, therefore, made out the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Further, typosquatting usually signals an intention on the part of the respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant (see section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.0). There is no right or legitimate interest in holding a domain name for that purpose and this also usually constitutes evidence that no such right or legitimate interest exists. Also, the registration and holding of a domain name to take advantage of such actual or potential confusion will usually involve bad faith registration and use (see sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1 of WIPO Overview 3.0) and the Panel holds that this is so in this case.

It follows that the Complainant has therefore made out the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) and 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arccelorrnittal.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Matthew Harris

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-05

Publish the Decision