

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108666

|                |                         |
|----------------|-------------------------|
| Case number    | CAC-UDRP-108666         |
| Time of filing | 2026-05-28 09:22:22     |
| Domain names   | thyssenkrupp-steell.com |

### Case administrator

|      |                             |
|------|-----------------------------|
| Name | Olga Dvořáková (Case admin) |
|------|-----------------------------|

### Complainants

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Organization | thyssenkrupp AG- thyssenkrupp Intellectual Property GmbH |
| Organization | thyssenkrupp Steel Europe AG                             |

### Respondent

|      |               |
|------|---------------|
| Name | Andrew Murray |
|------|---------------|

#### 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

thyssenkrupp AG (the "Complainant") is the owner of the EU trademark (Reg. No. 001198357) ThyssenKrupp, registered on June 7, 1999 (Nice classes 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 17, 19, 35, 36, 39, 42) and the long list of other international and national trademark registrations related to the well-known word sign "thyssenkrupp".

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a German industrial engineering and technology company that operates in sectors such as steel production, automotive components, materials services, and industrial solutions. It develops and manufactures products and technologies for industries including automotive, construction, energy, and manufacturing worldwide. The Panel is convinced that the ThyssenKrupp trademark is highly distinctive and well-established.

The Complainant owns a domain name composed of its trademark, namely <thyssenkrupp.com> (registered since December 5, 1996).

The disputed domain name <thyssenkrupp-steell.com> was registered on May 15, 2026 by Australian resident Andrew Murray. This domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known, distinctive trademark ThyssenKrupp and the generic term "steel" with a typo (additional letter "l" in the end), which is visually and phonetically confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark ThyssenKrupp.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name for a phishing scheme, which has nothing to do with any legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names.

---

#### 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 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

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark ThyssenKrupp. Considering the renown of the Complainant and its trademark ThyssenKrupp, it becomes evident that addition of the generic term "steel" with a typo (addition of the letter "l" in the end) to the Complainant's trademark does not set aside the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant presented prima facie evidence that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent's name (Andrew Murray) does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

As no administratively compliant response has been provided to the Panel and the prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the Respondent meant the Complainant's trademark ThyssenKrupp when he registered the disputed domain name <thyssenkrupp-steell.com> (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.1.1). Previous UDRP 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. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Respondent has not demonstrated any legitimate activity in respect of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the Complainant presented evidence showing that the disputed domain name was only used for a phishing scheme. As noted in section 2.13.1 of WIPO Overview 3.0, given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was clearly used in bad faith.

---

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

---

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

1. **thyssenkrupp-steell.com**: Transferred

---

## PANELLISTS

|      |                         |
|------|-------------------------|
| Name | <b>Darius Sauliūnas</b> |
|------|-------------------------|

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-07-02**

---

Publish the Decision

---