Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108760

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108760
Time of filing	2026-06-22 12:22:33
Domain names	france-arcelormittal.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Biz Moov

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 registration No. 947686 for ARCELORMITTAL, registered on 3 August 2007. The Complainant also owns and operates various domain names, including its main domain name, <arcelormittal.com>, registered on 27 January 2006. The disputed domain name <france-arcelormittal.com> was registered on 18 June 2026. At the time of the complaint, the disputed domain name redirected Internet users to the Complainant's official French website at <france.arcelormittal.com>. The DNS configuration for the disputed domain name also included active mail-exchange records.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

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

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 incorporates the ARCELORMITTAL mark in its entirety. The only additional element is the geographical term “france”, separated from the mark by a hyphen. Where a disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of a complainant's trademark, the addition of a geographical or other descriptive term does not ordinarily prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

As for the generic Top-Level Domain (“.com”), it is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in assessing confusing similarity.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once a 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 of 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 and that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the Complainant’s trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Further, the disputed domain name redirected Internet users to the Complainant's official French website. The Respondent has provided no explanation for that redirection. Such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and did not provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name nor

evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

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 disputed domain name and is widely known. Further, the disputed domain name redirected Internet users to the Complainant's official French website. This redirection indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its official online presence.

The active mail-exchange records associated with the disputed domain name also reinforce the potential for use of the disputed domain name for phishing. Although the record does not establish that the Respondent has in fact sent fraudulent or deceptive emails, the configuration creates a risk that email addresses using the disputed domain name could be perceived as genuine addresses associated with the Complainant's French operations.

Given the particular circumstances of this case and the distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark and its reputation, the fact that no response was filed, and the active mail-exchange records created, the Panel is persuaded on the evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its ARCELORMITTAL trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name and specifically targeted the Complainant.

Accordingly, the Panel finds 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. **france-arcelormittal.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Agmon**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-29

Publish the Decision