

**Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108214**

Case number	<b>CAC-UDRP-108214</b>
Time of filing	<b>2025-12-08 17:27:07</b>
Domain names	<b>arcelormittal-hqzvlna.rest</b>

**Case administrator**

Organization	<b>Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)</b>
--------------	--

**Complainant**

Organization	<b>ARCELORMITTAL</b>
--------------	----------------------

## Complainant representative

Organization	<b>NAMESHIELD S.A.S.</b>
--------------	--------------------------

**Respondent**

Name	<b>leon zhigalo</b>
------	---------------------

## 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 international trademark Registration No. 947686, dated August 3, 2007, for the name ARCELORMITTAL.

## 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 sizable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks. It operates its business under the name ARCELORMITTAL and is the owner of an international trademark registration for this name. The Complainant also owns a number of domain names that reflect its trademark including <arcelormittal.com> which was registered and has been in use by the Complainant since 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 2, 2025 and resolves to an authentication page.

---

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

##### COMPLAINANT

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as it incorporates the entirety of the trademark and adds only a hyphen, the term "hqzvlna", and the ".rest" gTLD.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name where it is not commonly known by the domain name and its use, to resolve to an authentication page, is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith where the Respondent had prior knowledge of the Complainant's famous trademark and based on the above-mentioned website resolution.

##### 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

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint; however, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 at paragraph 4.3; see also GROUPE CANAL + v. Danny Sullivan, 102809 (CAC January 21, 2020) ("the Panel, based on the poorly supported and conclusory allegations of the Complainant, retains that the Complainant has not prevailed on all three elements of the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and, therefore, rejects the Complaint.").

#### Confusing Similarity

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is a standing requirement which is satisfied if the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Furthermore, it is not as extensive as the “likelihood of confusion” test for trademark infringement applied by many courts. Rather, under the Policy confusing similarity is commonly tested by comparing the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name in appearance, sound, meaning, and overall impression. See *Administradora de Marcas RD, S. de R.L. de C.V. v. DNS Manager / Profile Group*, 101341 (CAC November 28, 2016).

It has been consistently held that “[r]egistration of a mark with governmental trademark agencies is sufficient to establish rights in that mark for the purposes of Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).” *Teleflex Incorporated v. Leisa Idalski*, FA 1794131 (FORUM July 31, 2018). In this case, the Complainant has submitted screenshots from the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) website demonstrating that it owns a registration of the ARCELORMITTAL trademark. The Panel accepts this evidence as proof of the Complainant’s asserted trademark rights.

Next, UDRP panels have consistently held that where the asserted trademark is recognizable within a disputed domain name, a minor misspelling does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The disputed domain name copies the entirety of the ARCELORMITTAL trademark and adds a hyphen, the term “hqzvina”, and the “.rest” gTLD which, in the present case, adds no meaning to the disputed domain name. *Lesaffre et Compagnie v. Tims Dozman*, 102430 (CAC May 2, 2019) (“the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. the “.com”) must be disregarded under the identity / confusing similarity test as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.”). Thus, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the asserted trademark and will lead internet users to wrongly believe that the disputed domain name originates from or is endorsed by the Complainant. Prior panels have found confusing similarity under similar fact situations. *Schneider Electric SE v. schneiderelectronics*, UDRP-108153 (CAC January 2, 2026) (“Adding the generic word “shop” and hyphen between words that form the Complainant’s trademark does not avoid a finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.”).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has rights to the ARCELORMITTAL trademark and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to such trademark. Thus, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## 2. Rights or Legitimate Interests:

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out certain circumstances which, if proven by the evidence presented, may demonstrate a respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in respect of a disputed domain name.

The Panel concludes, on the basis of the Complainant’s undisputed contentions, that the Respondent has not made use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as noted in paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The Respondent has not been authorized to use the Complainant’s ARCELORMITTAL trademark, either as domain name or in any other way. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to resolve to a page that contains a page that invites the user to input its login credentials. Therefore, this Panel concludes that the disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant’s ARCELORMITTAL trademark and that the Respondent is seeking to divert Internet users who are trying to reach the Complainant but, due to the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark, end up at the Respondent’s website instead. Past decisions under the Policy have held that such use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. See, e.g., *Boursorama v. fg gfgs*, UDRP-105565 (CAC July 25, 2023) (no bona fide use found where „the Respondent is taking advantage (or at least intends to take advantage) of the Complainant’s name and registered Trademark to obtain the credentials and/or personal information of consumers looking for their personal access page at the Complainant’s platform...”).

Further, as the Whois record for the disputed domain name identifies the Respondent as „leon zhigalo“, and whereas Respondent has submitted no Response nor made any other submission in this case, there is no evidence before this Panel to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that it has any trademark rights associated with the name “ARCELORMITTAL” under paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, it cannot be said that the Respondent has made a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain as noted in paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. There is no evidence of record to show, and this Panel is not aware of any information to indicate that the word “arcelormittal” has any generic or descriptive meaning. Nor does it appear that the disputed domain name and its resulting blank website are referring to the Complainant’s trademark in any nominative or other classic fair use manner such as for the purpose of commentary, news reporting, grievance, education, or the like.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) and of the Policy and demonstrated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

### 3. Bad Faith Registration and Use:

In order to prevail in a dispute, paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant prove that the disputed domain name has both been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that it is the largest steel producing company in the world and is the market leader in steel for use in a variety of products and industries. As such, its ARCELORMITTAL trademark is well-known and has been recognized as such in prior cases brought by the Complainant. See, e.g., ArcelorMittal SA v. Tina Campbell, DCO2018-0005 (WIPO March 28, 2018) (“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.”) This fact, combined with the disputed domain name’s use of the coined word ARCELORMITTAL plus the term „hqzvlna“ and the „-rest“ gTLD, leads this Panel to the conclusion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark. It has been held in prior decisions that such activity supports a finding of bad faith domain name registration. 7-Eleven, Inc. v. charles rasputin, FA 1829082 (FORUM March 9, 2019) (in relation to the domain name 7elevendelivered.com and others, “Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant’s rights in the 7 ELEVEN mark at the time of registering the infringing domain names. Actual knowledge of a complainant’s rights in a mark prior to registering a confusingly similar domain name can evince bad faith under Policy 4(a)(iii).”).

As for use, the Complainant has submitted evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to a page that contains login fields and seeks to obtain user credentials. Such activity has been held to demonstrate bad faith use of a domain name that is confusingly similar to an asserted trademark. Exness Holdings CY Limited v. Muser Jone, UDRP-105427 (CAC October 11, 2024) (bad faith found where “the disputed domain name resolves to a log-in page, which may be regarded as a phishing attempt by the Respondent, seeking to obtain log-in credentials of the Complainant’s legitimate customers.”). The Panel in this case finds that, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith as it creates a likelihood of confusion with the ARCELORMITTAL trademark and resolves to a blank website.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) and that the disputed domain name has been registered and 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-hqzvlna.rest**: Transferred

---

## PANELLISTS

Name	<b>Steven Levy Esq.</b>
------	-------------------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-08

Publish the Decision

---