Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109054

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109054
Time of filing	2026-10-06 10:19:44
Domain names	arcelormtiltal.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	aaron

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 (the "Domain Name").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of international trade mark n° 947686 for the standard character mark "ArcelorMittal" registered on 3 August 2007 in classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41 and 42, in reliance upon an earlier Benelux trade mark registration. This international mark has proceeded to grant, either in full or in at least some respects, in over 40 jurisdictions.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS CLAIMED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT

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 55.6 million tons crude steel made in 2025. It holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks.

The Complainant also owns a domain name portfolio. The portfolio includes the domain name <arcelormittal.com> registered since 27 January 2006, which is used for the Complainant's website.

The Domain Name was registered on 3 October 2026 and does not resolve to any active website. MX servers have also been

configured for the Domain Name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the 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 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 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 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 accepts that this is a clear and obvious case of typosquatting. The only sensible reading of the Domain Name is as a misspelling of the Complainant's name and trade mark, in which the letters "i" and "t" have been transposed and an additional letter "l" has been inserted, combined with the ".com" top level domain ("TLD").

It follows from this that the Complainant's mark is clearly recognisable in the Domain Name and that the Complainant thereby holds a mark that is "confusingly similar" to the Domain Name as that term is understood under the Policy (see sections 1.7 and 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1). The Complainant has, therefore, made out the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Further, typosquatting usually signals an intention on the part of the respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant (see section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1). There is no right or legitimate interest in holding a domain name for that purpose and this also usually constitutes evidence that no such right or legitimate interest exists. Also, the registration and holding of a domain name to take advantage of such actual or potential confusion will usually involve bad faith registration and use (see sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1) and the Panel holds that this is so in this case. The fact that the Domain Name does not appear to have been used for an active website does not prevent such a finding (see section 3.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

It follows that the Complainant has therefore made out the requirements of paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant also relies upon the configuration of MX records and possible email use of the Domain Name in support of its contentions, but does not explain this further. The DNS records provided by the Complainant suggest that they may not have been set up by the Registrar, and if this is correct that would point to intended email use. However, as none of this is actually addressed in the Complaint, the Panel declines to take this into consideration when coming to its decision.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arcelormtiltal.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Matthew Harris**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-05

Publish the Decision