Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108662

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108662
Time of filing	2026-05-20 09:28:56
Domain names	arcelormittals.cfd

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Isaac Fernández

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 owns international trade mark registration No 947686 ARCELORMITTAL, first registered on 3 August 2007 in international classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, and 39-42. The Complainant's trade mark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant owns a portfolio of domain names including and consisting of the name ARCELORMITTAL, including the domain <arcelormittal.com>, registered on 27 January 2006, which is connected to the Complainant's official website through which it informs Internet users and customers about its products and services.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is one of the largest steel producing companies in the world and is a market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging with some 55.6 million tons of crude steel made in 2025. It operates extensive distribution networks.

The disputed domain name <arcelormittals.cfd> was registered on 11 May 2026. As at the date of the amended complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive page without substantive content. As at the date of this decision, it returned a host error message and was not accessible.

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 identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark 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

With regard to the first UDRP element, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark ARCELORMITTAL. Indeed, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark in its entirety, save that the disputed domain name adds the letter “s” at the end of the Complainant's trade mark. The Panel considers the present case to be a plain case of "typosquatting", i.e., the disputed domain name contains an obvious and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trade mark, which is not sufficient to alter the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trade mark. Minor alterations to the Complainant's trade mark do not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, its trade mark and associated domain name. The Panel follows in this respect the view established by numerous other decisions that a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trade mark is to be considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant trade mark (see, for example, CAC Case No. 103124, Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG v. Fundacion Comercio Electronico <boehringeringelheimpetrreebates.com>; CAC Case No. 101990, JCDECAUX SA v. Emma Purnell <jcdeceux.com>; CAC Case No. 101892, JCDECAUX SA v. Lab-Clean Inc <jcdacaux.com>; WIPO Case No. D2005-0941, Bayerische Motoren Werke AG, Sauber Motorsport AG v. Petaluma Auto Works <bmwsauberf1 .com>; WIPO Case No. D2015-1679, LinkedIn Corporation v. Daphne Reynolds <linkedlnjobs.com>; CAC Case No. 103960, SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE v. michele Swanson <schnaider-electric.com> ("the obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark SCHNAIDER ELECTRIC instead of SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC is a clear evidence of "typosquatting"); and CAC Case No. 103166, BOURSORAMA SA v. Cloud DNS Ltd <recoverbousorama.link> ("A domain name that contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark and uses a common name, obvious or intentional misspelling of that mark is considered by UDRP panels to be similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element (see paragraph 1. 9 WIPO Overview 3.0)"; and, specifically with regard to the Complainant, see: WIPO Case No. D2020-3457, ArcelorMittal (Société Anonyme) v. Name Redacted <arcelormltal.com> (“As the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant’s trademark by just two letters, it must be considered a prototypical example of typosquatting – which intentionally takes advantage of Internet users that inadvertently type an incorrect address (often a misspelling of the complainant’s trademark) when seeking to access the trademark owner’s website. WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 1.9 states that “[a] domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element.”)).

With regard to the second UDRP element, there is no evidence before the Panel to suggest that the Respondent has made any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Neither is there any indication that the Respondent is making legitimate non-

commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Indeed, the disputed domain name is not being used for any active website but resolves to a website without substantive content. A lack of content at the disputed domain has in itself been regarded by other panels as supporting a finding that the respondent lacked a bona fide offering of goods or services and did not make legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 1773444, Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc v. Joannet Macket/JM Consultants). The Panel further finds that the Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant in any way and is neither licensed nor otherwise authorised to make any use of the Complainant's trade mark, or to apply for or use the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Whois information for the disputed domain name does not suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name <arcelormittals.cfd>. Past panels have held that a respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name, as is equally not the case here (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> ("Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as "Chad Moston / Elite Media Group." The Panel therefore finds under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii).")). Finally, there is no indication that the Respondent is making legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. As set out above, the domain name is passively held and identical to the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark. Other UDRP panels have consistently found that domain names identical to a complainant's trade mark carry a high risk of implied affiliation and are, by their nature, incapable of supporting fair use by an unaffiliated party (see section 2.5.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0). Finally, as noted above, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trade mark; the Panel follows the view expressed in other decisions that typosquatting can evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name (see, for example, Forum Case No. 1597465, The Hackett Group, Inc. v. Brian Herns / The Hackett Group <thehackettgroups.com> ('The Panel agrees that typosquatting is occurring, and finds this is additional evidence that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests under Policy 'I 4(a)(ii).")). Against this background, and absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

With regard to the third UDRP element, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent either knew, or should have known, that the disputed domain name would be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark, and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in full knowledge of the Complainant's trade mark. Indeed, if the Respondent had carried out a Google search for the term "Arcelormittals", the search results would have yielded immediate results related to the Complainant, its websites, and its connected business and services. The Panel considers it likely that the disputed domain name would not have been registered if it were not for the Complainant's trade mark (see, for example, WIPO Case No D2004-0673, Ferrari Spa v. American Entertainment Group Inc <ferrariowner.com>). It is in any event difficult to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by any third party that would not be illegitimate on the grounds that it would constitute passing off, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trade mark law under circumstances where the disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant's trade mark ARCELORMITTAL, and similar to the Complainant's genuine domain name used by the latter to promote its goods and services. In view of the fact that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trade mark, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark. Previous Panels have seen such actions as evidence of bad faith, which is a view the Panel in this proceeding shares (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 877979, Microsoft Corporation v. Domain Registration Philippines <microssoft.com> ("In addition, Respondent's misspelling of Complainant's MICROSOFT mark in the <microssoft.com> domain name indicates that Respondent is typosquatting, which is a further indication of bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy 'I 4(a)(iii).")). The Panel derives yet further support for a finding of bad faith on the part of the Respondent from the fact that the Complainant's trade mark registrations long predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name because the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trade mark was registered as long ago as 2007, whereas the Disputed Domain Name was registered in 2026, constituting a gap of nearly 20 years (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2021-1934, Natixis v. Felix Anderson <natixisbnk.com>, where the Panel found that: "… In addition, a gap of more than ten years between registration of the Complainant's trademark and the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name (containing the trademark) can, in certain circumstances, be an indicator of bad faith. (See Asian World of Martial Arts Inc. v. Texas International Property Associates, WIPO Case No. D2007-1415). In this case, the Complainant's rights in its trademark predate any rights that could possibly flow from the Respondent's registration by 15 years)". Absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel therefore also accepts that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arcelormittals.cfd**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Gregor Kleinknecht LLM MCIArb**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-11