Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108399

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108399
Time of filing	2026-02-10 07:54:47
Domain names	arcelormiitall.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	sandug

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 submitted evidence that it is the owner of the international trademark “ArcelorMittal” (wordmark), no. 947686, registered on August 3, 2007, in classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41 and 42, valid in various jurisdictions (hereinafter the “Trademark” or the “Complainant’s Trademark”).

The Complainant also submitted evidence that it has registered the domain name <arcelormittal.com> on January 27, 2006.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant is a major steel-producing company, active worldwide, and a market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging industries.

The Complainant further states that it is the owner of the Complainant’s Trademark and of various domain names, such as the domain name <arcelormittal.com> (since January 27, 2006).

The disputed domain name was registered on February 6, 2026. The domain name is currently inactive. Furthermore, the

Complainant states that MX records are configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

Confusing similarity

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's Trademark “ARCELORMITTAL” with the addition of one letter I, and one letter L, and the deletion of one letter T.

According to the Complainant, the misspelling of the Trademark is characteristic of a “typosquatting” practice. The Complainant argues that a slight spelling variation does not prevent a domain name from being confusingly similar to a trademark. Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the gTLD “.com” does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Trademark.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant’s Trademark, with small changes, more precisely the addition of one letter I, and one letter L, and the deletion of one letter T.

The Panel is of the opinion that these changes do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. The Panel sees this as a case of typosquatting, with an intention to target internet users who make typographical errors when attempting to reach the Complainant. The gTLD ".com" may be disregarded when it comes to considering whether a domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Rights or legitimate interests

As regards paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, while the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, it is commonly accepted that this should not result in an often-impossible task of proving a negative. Therefore, numerous previous panels have found that 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 burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, the Complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. If

the Respondent does come forward with some allegations or evidence of relevant rights or legitimate interests, the Panel then must weigh all the evidence, with the burden of proof always remaining on the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that:

- The Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the holder of the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent is not related to the Complainant. The Respondent does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Complainant;
- The Complainant has not granted a license or authorization to the Respondent to use the Complainant's Trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name;
- The disputed domain name is currently inactive and there is no demonstrable plan to use it.

The Respondent did not file an administratively compliant (or any) response. The Respondent did not provide evidence that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (the Respondent could have provided evidence of the factors mentioned in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, but failed to do so).

The Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name from the following facts:

- The disputed domain name includes the entire Trademark of the Complainant, with some additions that do not add any meaning to the Trademark and do not create any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.
- There is no evidence that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the term "ARCELORMIITALL". The WHOIS information does not provide any information that might indicate any rights of the Respondent to use the term "ARCELORMIITALL".
- The Complainant's Trademark has been widely used well before the registration date of the disputed domain name.
- The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website.
- There is no evidence to show that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain or to misleadingly divert consumers. On the contrary, it appears that the Respondent is taking advantage (or at least intends to take advantage) of the Complainant's name and the registered Trademark to attract consumers making typos and creating a likelihood of confusion.
- The Respondent does not seem to have any consent or authorisation to use the Trademark or variations thereof and does not seem to be related in any way to the Complainant.
- The Respondent has not shown that it holds any trademark rights or other rights regarding the term "ARCELORMIITALL".

In sum, on the balance of probabilities, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary or any administratively compliant response being put forward by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Bad faith

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark. The Complainant states that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its Trademark, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Trademark. The Complainant states that the misspelling of its Trademark was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark. The Complainant further emphasises that the disputed domain name is inactive. The Complainant also mentions that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes.

The Panel weighs these arguments and facts as follows:

First, as mentioned already, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's Trademark "ArcelorMittal" entirely, with the mere addition of the letters I and L and the deletion of the letter T. These changes do not add any meaning to the disputed domain name and do not take away a risk of confusion among the public.

Second, the Complainant's Trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by many years.

Third, the Complainant's Trademark covers the territory of the United States of America, i.e., the Respondent's home country.

Fourth, the Panel emphasises that the term "ArcelorMittal" has no general meaning in any language, and in fact refers to the names of the European steelmaker "Arcelor" and its acquiror "Mittal". It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent would have come up with a domain name consisting of the term "ARCELORMIITALL" without having prior knowledge of the Complainant and its Trademark and activities. On the balance of probabilities, it is evident that the Respondent had knowledge of the existence of the Complainant and its activities, and of the existence and scope of the Complainant's Trademark at the time of registration and use of the disputed domain name.

Fifth, the Respondent does not seem to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, and not for a legitimate non-commercial or fair use. The Respondent does not seem to have any concrete plans for such bona fide offering or otherwise legitimate or fair use.

The Respondent did not contest any of the Complainant's arguments and did not provide any explanation concerning its choice for

registering and using a domain name that includes the Complainant's registered Trademark with only small changes.

Given the arguments and facts described above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is not being used for any bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name is instead used to misleadingly attract internet users for commercial gain. The Panel is convinced that the Respondent had the Complainant and its Trademark in mind when registering and using the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is being used for the purpose of misleading Internet users. There is no evidence whatsoever of any bona fide offering of goods or services.

For all the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arcelormiitall.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Bart Van Besien**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-09

Publish the Decision