Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108561

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108561
Time of filing	2026-04-08 08:21:07
Domain names	arcelorrnittal.cam

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Mike westly

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 for ARCELORMITTAL, registered on August 3, 2007, covering classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant also owns and operates various domain names, including its main domain name, <arcelormittal.com>, which was registered on January 27, 2006.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Luxembourg company and one of the world's leading steel-producing and mining companies. The Complainant is active in the production and distribution of steel for use in the automotive, construction, household appliances, packaging, and related sectors.

The disputed domain name <arcelorrnittal.cam> was registered on April 5, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to the URL https://dckf.in/, which appeared to be a website of "The DC Kizhakemuri Foundation" promoting art, education, and culture. The evidence also shows that MX servers are configured in relation to the disputed domain name.

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 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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns registered trademark rights in the ARCELORMITTAL mark.

In this case, the disputed domain name <arcelorrnittal.cam> consists of an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trade mark. The disputed domain name incorporates an additional letter "r" after "arcelo-" and substitutes the letter "m" in "mittal" with the letter "n", resulting in "arcelorrnittal". These minor alterations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trade mark. Rather, they are characteristic of typosquatting and are insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trade mark.

As for the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".cam", it is well established that the gTLD is not relevant to the issue of identity or confusing similarity between the Complainant's trade mark and the domain name in dispute (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it has been the registered owner of the ARCELORMITTAL mark long before the date that the disputed domain name was registered. The Complainant did not authorise the Respondent to use the Complainant's trade mark. Moreover, the Complainant's International registration covers the designation of Algeria, which is the country where the Respondent appears to be located. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a Response or provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name, nor evidence to show it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. The typosquatted nature of the disputed domain name is indicative of the likely intention of the Respondent to mislead or cause confusion. This cannot amount to fair use or confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trade mark was registered many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's distinctive trade mark and differs from it only by minor typographical alterations, but which are deceptively visually similar. Considering the fact that the Complainant is one of the largest companies in its field with worldwide operations, the Panel is persuaded that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its ARCELORMITTAL trade mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered with the Complainant's mark in mind. The typosquatting also indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trade mark and it simply added and replaced certain letters in order to confuse Internet users and attract Internet traffic.

The disputed domain name redirects to a website promoting services unrelated to the Complainant. In the Panel's view, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark. The fact that there is an MX record associated with the disputed domain name suggests an intention on the Respondent's part to use the disputed domain name for illegal purposes, such as phishing or impersonation. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegal activity constitutes bad faith registration and use. (See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.)

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under 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. **arcelorrnittal.cam**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Francine Tan**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-14

Publish the Decision