Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108179

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108179
Time of filing	2025-11-26 17:09:11
Domain names	arcalormittals.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	gasolinnn pl

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 owner of the international trademark n° 947686 ARCELORMITTAL registered on August 3, 2007, covering ten classes of goods and services, and designating the following countries for protection:

- Australia, Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba, Curaçao, European Union, Georgia, Iceland, Japan, Korea (Republic of), Norway, Singapore, Sint Maarten (Dutch part), Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye, USA, Uzbekistan, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Belarus, Switzerland, China, Cuba, Algeria, Egypt, Croatia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Korea (Democratic People's Republic of), Kazakhstan, Liberia, Morocco, Monaco, Moldova (Republic of), Montenegro, Republic of North Macedonia, Mongolia, Serbia, Russian Federation, Sudan, San Marino, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Viet Nam

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant claims to be the largest steel-producing company in the world and the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances, and packaging, with 57.9 million tons of crude steel made in 2024. The Complainant's primary website is maintained at <arcelormittal.com>.

The disputed domain name <arcalormittals.com> was registered on November 24, 2025. The Complainant provides evidence that the disputed domain name has resolved to the registrar Namecheap's parking page with commercial links to unrelated businesses. The Complainant also provides evidence that MX servers are configured for the disputed domain name. Currently, there is no active site resolving from the disputed domain name.

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). The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark ARCELORMITTAL. The obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark ARCELORMITTAL (i.e. the substitution of the letter "E" by the letter "A" and the addition of the letter "S") is characteristic of a typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

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). The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant states that it 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 Complainant's trademark ARCELORMITTAL, or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's name is entirely different and unrelated to the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark ARCELORMITTAL. The disputed domain name has been used to point to a parking page with commercial links provided by the registrar Namecheap, and has MX servers configured. Respondent has failed to appear and demonstrate any potential legitimate use of the disputed domain name. Therefore, Complainant has satisfied its burden of proof under this element of the Policy, unrebutted by Respondent.

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). The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's distinctive trademark ARCELORMITTAL.

The Complainant contends that its trademark is widely known. Past panels have confirmed the notoriety of the trademark ARCELORMITTAL in the following cases:

- CAC Case No. 101908, ARCELORMITTAL v. China Capital ("The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark "ArcelorMittal", at least since 2007. The Complainant's trademark was registered prior to the registration of the disputed domain name (February 7, 2018) and is widely well-known.")
- CAC Case No. 101667, ARCELORMITTAL v. Robert Rudd ("The Panel is convinced that the Trademark is highly distinctive and well-established.")

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and its reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., WIPO Case No. DCO2018-0005, ArcelorMittal SA v. Tina Campbell ("The Panel finds that the trademark ARCELORMITTAL is so well-known internationally for metals and steel production that it is inconceivable that the Respondent might have registered a domain name similar to or incorporating the mark without knowing of it."). Indeed, the misspelling of the trademark appears intentionally designed to create internet user confusion.

Finally, the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes.

Complainant contends that 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. Absent any information from the Respondent to rebut this contention, the Panel agrees with the Complainant's contention.

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 Respondent has failed to appear and demonstrate any potential legitimate use of the disputed domain name, or to rebut the Complainant's evidence and argument as to bad faith. Therefore, the Complainant has satisfied its burden of proof under the Policy

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arcalormittals.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mike Rodenbaugh**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-11

Publish the Decision