Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108173

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108173
Time of filing	2025-11-26 09:40:47
Domain names	arcelormittalbuildingsolutionsdominicana.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Leonardo Martinez P.

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 relies on international trademark registration number 947686 for the word mark ArcelorMittal registered on 3 August 2007 in classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21 and 39-42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the largest steel producing company in the world and the market-leader in steel for use in construction, amongst other areas. It registered the domain name arcelormittal.com on 27 January 2006 and uses it to locate a set of websites at sub-domains.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <arcelormittalbuildingsolutionsdominicana.com> on 19 November 2025. MX servers are configured but the disputed domain name does not locate any active web page. The Respondent's street address is in the Dominican Republic.

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in the mark ArcelorMittal. The disputed domain name consists of this mark together with generic elements, namely "buildingsolutions" (describing a field of economic activity in which the Complainant is active), "dominicana" (referring to the country, Dominican Republic), and the generic top level domain name suffix. The Panel is satisfied that the generic elements do not provide any real distinction and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

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 Panel finds on the evidence that the Respondent has not used or made any preparations to use the disputed domain name or any corresponding name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use. Nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name.

In the absence of any evidence from the Respondent supporting his assertion that he was authorised by the Complainant to register and use the disputed domain name, despite the Panel’s request to provide any such evidence, the Panel also concludes that the Respondent has not been authorised by the Complainant to register or use it.

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 disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's very well known mark together with wholly generic elements, is such that any good faith use of it without the consent of the Complainant is extremely improbable. In the absence of any evidence of consent or of good faith use or intent, the Panel infers on the balance of probability that it was registered and is being used, at least passively, in 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

The disputed domain name consists of Complainant's well-known registered mark together with purely generic elements. There is no evidence of good faith use, although MX records have been configured. The Respondent did not provide any evidence supporting his assertion that he was authorised to register and use the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name or any corresponding name; and that it was registered and is being used at least passively in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

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

1. **arcelormittalbuildingsolutionsdominicana.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Turner**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-01

Publish the Decision