Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108181

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108181
Time of filing	2025-11-26 16:53:01
Domain names	arcelormttal-br.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (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 relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has adduced evidence showing that it is the owner of the international trademark ARCELORMITTAL No. 947686, registered on 3 August 2007 in Nice Classification List classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41 and 42 on the basis of an original registration with the Benelux Office for Intellectual Property.

The Complainant also adduced evidence to show it is the registrant of the domain name <arcelormittal.com>, registered on 27 January 2006. The Complainant claims without submitting evidence to have a wider portfolio of domain name registrations.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <arcelormttal-br.com> on 24 November 2025 according to the Registrar Verification obtained by the CAC Case Administrator.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the largest steel producing company in the world and is the market leader in steel for automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging use, with nearly 58 million tonnes of crude steel made in 2024. It holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

Screenshot evidence adduced by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a registrar-hosted parking

page displaying call to action (CTA) buttons hyperlinked to announcements for common consumer inquiries such as for offers of cheap airline flights. Further screenshot evidence shows that the disputed domain name e-mail (MX) server addresses are configured to redirect e-mails to a “privacy” e-mail service provider.

The Panel's routine scrutiny of the Case File revealed that the Respondent’s contact details that were given at registration of the disputed domain name, and which were supplied to the Panel thanks to the Registration Verification step in this proceeding, are defective in these ways:

- The street address given refers to a shop in Monterrey, Mexico, that has a completely different name to that given by the Respondent;

- The Respondent gave variously “Mexico City” and “Cancun” as the city or region in which the street is located whereas the city of Monterrey is in the Mexican federal state of Nuevo León;

- The Respondent gave a fixed-line telephone number with an area code in the United States (Indiana);

- The name given for the Respondent does not admit of identification on its own and is on its face fanciful and thereby suspicious.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

1. The Complainant’s rights affected by the disputed domain name

The disputed domain name < arcelormttal-br.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark ARCELORMITTAL, with only a typographical error (omission of the “i” in the second part of the trademark) and addition of the geographical signifier <-br> in the stem of the disputed domain name to distinguish it from the trademark in its entirety. These variations do not change the overall (false) impression that the disputed domain name's designation is connected to the Complainant’s trademark. The technical TLD suffix <.com> is a technical element that does not reduce the disputed domain name's confusingly similarity with the Complainant's trademark.

2. The Respondent’s lack of right or interest in the disputed domain name

The Respondent in this case is not known as the disputed domain name, is not related in any way with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark ARCELORMITTAL or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name. Nor does the Complainant carry out any activity for, or have any business with, the Respondent. Finally, the Respondent’s use of a parking page with commercial links does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

3. The Respondent’s bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name

The Complainant’s trademark ARCELORMITTAL is widely known. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the disputed domain name points to a parking page with commercial links. This amounts to the Respondent attempting to attract internet users for commercial gain to his own website thanks to the Complainant’s trademarks, so evidencing bad faith use. Moreover, the domain name has been set up with e-mail server (MX) records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes, none of which can conceivably be good faith in nature.

RESPONDENT:

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks 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 that 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 the UDRP were met and that there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

The Panel notes that its résumé of the Parties' contentions includes for the Complainant only its arguments pertinent to reaching a decision in this proceeding; it omits in particular references to past ADR Panels' Decisions. The Panel declines to consider a contention made by the Complainant regarding the sufficiency of prima facie proof, since the point made is clearly redundant in the clear circumstances of this proceeding.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1. Confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant' trademark

The Respondent has combined in the disputed domain name's stem the Complainant's duly substantiated trademark ARCELORMITTAL with a hyphened indicator, <-br>, that is presumably intended to be a geographical one referring to Brazil. It is true that the Respondent has done so by omitting the letter "l" that the ARCELORMITTAL brand contains, but this is so slight a typographical variation that it does not affect the strong optical similarity of the disputed domain name's stem with that brand. Nor does the presence of the TLD <.com> extension reduce the impression of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark that is produced by the Respondent's formulation of the disputed domain name's stem. On these grounds, the Panel FINDS that the requirements of the first part of the UDRP cumulative three-part test are met.

2. The Respondent's lack of rights or a legitimate interest

The Case File shows (see Factual Background) that obviously inaccurate contact details were furnished by the Respondent at registration. Indeed, these appear to have been fabricated carelessly. There is on the evidence also no indication of any legitimate connection between the Respondent and the disputed domain name. Rather, there is an indication of its illegitimate exploitation by reason of its resolution to a parking page bearing commercial links. The Panel therefore FINDS that the requirements of the second part of the UDRP test are met.

3. The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name and use of it in bad faith

The Panel notes here:

- The Respondent's furnishing of inaccurate identifying details at registration, thereby not disclosing the Respondent's true identity or whereabouts;

- The manner in which the Respondent formulated the disputed domain name at registration to create an impression of confusing similarity with not only the trademark but also the corporate identity of the Complainant;

- The Respondent's configuration of the disputed domain name's e-mail DNS services by pointing them to third-party, "privacy" MX servers, thereby potentially facilitating known kinds of abusive activities with respect to e-mail users such as phishing;

- The Respondent's use of a parking page with commercial links, which appears solely designed to attract internet users for commercial gain due to the Complainant's rights and reputation, and to the detriment of such rights and reputation.

The Panel FINDS that these factors together adequately substantiate the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name, thereby satisfying the requirements of the last part of the UDRP cumulative test.

The Panel therefore ORDERS the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

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

PANELLISTS

Name	**Kevin Madders**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-12

Publish the Decision