Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108768

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108768
Time of filing	2026-06-23 14:43:13
Domain names	arcelormittal.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	venkatesh Gude

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 the international trademark No. 947686 ArcelorMittal, registered on August 3, 2007.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a company specialized in steel producing (please see their website at: www.arcelormittal.com).

The Complainant is the largest steel producing company in the world and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging with 57.9 million tons of crude steel made in 2024. It holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

In addition to the international trademark n° 947686 ArcelorMittal, the Complainant also owns an important domain names portfolio, such as the domain name <arcelormittal.com> registered since January 27, 2006.

The disputed domain name <arcelormittal.com> (<xn--arelormittal-rq1f.com>) was registered on June 17, 2026, and resolves to a parking page with commercial links.

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

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

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

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

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

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint; however, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 at paragraph 4.3; see also eGalaxy Multimedia Inc. v. ON HOLD By Owner Ready To Expire, FA 157287 (Forum June 26, 2003) (“Because Complainant did not produce clear evidence to support its subjective allegations [. . .] the Panel finds it appropriate to dismiss the Complaint”).

As to the first element, the Complainant has shown that it has rights in the ArcelorMittal mark and that the mark is very well-known. The Panel finds the disputed domain name <arcelormittal.com> to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark ArcelorMittal because it incorporates the mark in its entirety and merely substitutes the letter “C” by the Cyrillic letter ES “c”, which does nothing to distinguish the domain name from the mark, together with the inconsequential top-level domain “.com”, which may be ignored under this element. The Complainant has established this element.

As to the second element, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances as examples which, if established by the Respondent, shall demonstrate rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, i.e.

(i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the use by the Respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is not related in any way with the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither licence nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark ArcelorMittal, nor to apply for registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark ArcelorMittal.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name <arcelormittal.com> was registered by the Respondent on June 17, 2026, long after the Complainant has shown that its ArcelorMittal mark had become very well-known. Moreover, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark ArcelorMittal. Finally, the disputed domain name points to a parking page with commercial links. This is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

These circumstances, together with the Complainant's assertions, are sufficient to constitute a prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The evidentiary burden therefore shifts to the Respondent to show that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See JUUL Labs, Inc. v. Dryx Emerson / KMF Events LTD, FA1906001849706 (Forum July 17, 2019). The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has established this element.

As to the third element, the circumstances set out above in relation to the second element satisfy the Panel that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's very well-known ArcelorMittal mark when the Respondent registered the typosquatted disputed domain name. Typosquatting demonstrates registration and use in bad faith. Further, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. This demonstrates registration and use in bad faith to attract users for commercial gain under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant has established this element.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arcelormittal.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Alan Limbury**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-17

Publish the Decision