Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108299

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108299
Time of filing	2026-01-06 10:15:22
Domain names	arcelorllc.one

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Andrii Voronin

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 a worldwide-recognized multinational steel manufacturing corporation formed in 2006 and headquartered in Luxembourg for use in automotive, construction, household appliances, and packaging.

According to the submitted evidence, the Complainant owns the following trademark:

-International Trademark for ARCELOR (word mark), Registration No. 778212, registered on February 25, 2002, and in force until February 25, 2032, in International Classes 01, 06, 07, 09, 12, 37, 40, and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant states that it is one of the largest steel-producing companies in the world and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances, and packaging, 57.9 million tons of crude steel produced in 2024. It holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

The Complainant is one of the world's leading integrated steel and mining companies. According to the evidence submitted, the Complainant is the leading steel company with a high degree of geographic diversification, as in Africa, the Commonwealth of Independent States, Europe, North and South America, with primary steelmaking facilities in 16 countries, and industrial presence in

59 countries. Globally, the Complainant had approximately 125,000 employees; more than 200 trademarked products; more than 900 active patents, and more than 100 R&D programs in progress.

The Complainant also owns a relevant domain name portfolio, including the domain name <arcelor.com> registered since August 29, 2001.

The disputed domain name <arcelorllc.one> was registered on **January 01, 2026**. By the time of filing, it resolved to an inactive website, and currently resolves to a landing page website for blogging health and fitness-related articles in polish language.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant Contentions:

- The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name <arcelorllc.one> is confusingly similar to its trademark ARCELOR and that the addition of the term "LLC" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark ARCELOR.
- The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, given that it is not commonly known by it; that is not related in any way to the Complainant, nor does it carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark ARCELOR, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant; the disputed domain name resolves to a website with no content, which shows the lack of a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use in accordance to paragraph 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy, citing Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc. v. Joannet Macket / JM Consultants, Claim No. FA1802001773444.
- The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, given that the trademark ARCELOR is widely known, confirmed by previous panelists, i.e., Arcelormittal (SA) v. floyd martins, WIPO Case No. DME2018-0005; ARCELORMITTAL S.A. v. Arcelor Staffing Solution, CAC UDRP Case No. 100756; that the Complainant's trademark distinctiveness and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark value; the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name points to a website without content; that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and that it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law, citing Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; CBS Broadcasting, Inc. v. Dennis Toeppen, WIPO Case No. D2000-0400.

Response

The Respondent did not reply to any of the Complainant's contentions.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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 accordance with Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the onus is on the Complainant to prove:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

In this case, no Response or any communication has been submitted by the Respondent, which, according to the panelists' consensus view, would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed, see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.3. Therefore, this Panel shall analyze the evidence submitted by the Complainant and decide this dispute under the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard, as set out in paragraphs 14 and 15(a) of the Rules, and WIPO Overview 3.0, section 4.2.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of having trademark rights over the term ARCELOR as set out in paragraph 4.a.(i) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the addition of the term "llc" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark ARCELOR for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

In relation to the generic Top-Level Domain ".one", it is well established that such element may typically be disregarded when it is used as a technical requirement of a domain name registration. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

Therefore, the disputed domain name <arcelorllc.one> is confusingly similar to Complainant's ARCELOR trademark.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

Rights or Legitimate Interests

Based on the submitted evidence, and considering the Respondent's Default, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established its prima facie case in relation to the Second Element of the Policy, due to:

(1) The Respondent selected a well-known trademark as ARCELOR, established at least since 2002, intentionally added a term as "llc", with it, generating confusion among the Internet users who seek or expect to find the Complainant on the Internet. The Panel finds that such composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.1.

(2) Nothing in the records suggests or infers that the Respondent is associated or affiliated with the Complainant;

(3) The Complainant has not granted any rights to the Respondent to use the ARCELOR trademark, whether a license to offer any product or service, or any rights to apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant;

(4) There is no evidence that the Respondent has become commonly known by the term "arcelorllc.one";

(5) It appears the Respondent decided to provide content to the website during the course of the present proceeding—specifically a blog for health and fitness-related topics in Polish, open to comments and data collection. The Panel perceives this change as a conscious attempt by the Respondent to retain the disputed domain name, which underscores the significant risks inherent in cases of passive holding. The Panel finds that such uses, whether falling under the Passive Holding Doctrine or suggesting sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, represent a risk to Internet users and therefore cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

> "Finally, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide its arguments in support of its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure as it considers appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Rules. In the absence of any submissions from the Respondent, the Panel accepts the Complainant's prima facie case and finds that paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP is therefore fulfilled." See ARCELORMITTAL v. Elena Gimenez, CAC UDRP Case No. 108071.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

a) Registration in Bad Faith:

The Complainant was founded in 2006 and acquired its trademark Rights over the term ARCELOR at least since 2002. The Panel notes that the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark ARCELOR have been recognized by previous panelists (ARCELORMITTAL v. Oori Fintes, CAC-UDRP Case No. 108119; ARCELORMITTAL v. Meriel' Peterich, CAC-UDRP Case No. 107966; Arcelormittal v. (Jian Yu Yao), WIPO Case No. D2024-0197).

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Accordingly, section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.0 states that:

> "Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or **confusingly similar** (particularly domain names comprising typos **or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith**." (emphasis added).

Concerning additional bad faith factors, section 3.2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0 states that:

> "Particular circumstances panels may take into account in assessing whether the respondent's registration of a domain name is in bad faith include: (i) the nature of the domain name (e.g., a typo of a widely-known mark, or a domain name incorporating the complainant's mark plus an additional term such as a descriptive or geographic term, or one that corresponds to the complainant's area of activity or natural zone of expansion), (ii) the chosen top-level domain (e.g., particularly where corresponding to the complainant's area of business activity or natural zone of expansion), (iii) **the content of any website to which the domain name directs, including any changes in such content and the timing thereof**, (iv) the timing and circumstances of the registration (particularly following a product launch, or the complainant's failure to renew its domain name registration), (v) any respondent pattern of targeting marks along a range of factors, such as a common area of commerce, intended consumers, or geographic location, (vi) **a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the respondent's choice of the domain name**, or (vii) **other indicia generally suggesting that the respondent had somehow targeted the complainant**." (emphasis added).

Furthermore, in the present case, to this Panel, the Respondent had (more than) sufficient time to learn about Complainant's business activity and the value of its trademarks. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.2.

b) Bad Faith Use:

The Panel[1] will decide this element of the Policy based on the use given by the Respondent at the time of filing the Complaint[2]. Therefore, as multiple previous panelists have found since 2000, this Panel finds that each of the Passive Holding Doctrine factors has been proved in this case, as follows:

(i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark ARCELOR,

(ii) the lack of Response or any communication provided by the Respondent or evidence of good-faith in its favor;

(iii) the use of a privacy service by the Respondent, concealing its identity, and

(iv) The disputed domain name's sudden activation as a blog and interactive website illustrates the risks inherent in passively held domain names. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

---

[1] Paragraph 10 of the Rules.

[2] Concerning changes in the website content, see Société Air France v. Whois Privacy Contact, Netim / Buddhika Athauda, WIPO Case No. D2018-1206.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arcelorllc.one**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**María Alejandra López García**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-04

Publish the Decision