

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ARCELORMITTAL v. traore NA, N A

Case No. D2025-1753

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ARCELORMITTAL, Luxembourg, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is traore NA, N A, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corporate-arceloremittal.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 2, 2025. On May 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 7, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 9, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 12, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Dilek Zeybel as the sole panelist in this matter on June 13, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is ARCELORMITTAL, a company operating in the steel industry, providing steel for use in the automotive, construction, household appliance, and packaging sectors. In 2024, the Complainant produced 57.9 million tons of crude steel and is recognized as one of the leading steel manufacturers worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations worldwide, including but not limited to the following:

- International trademark, ARCELORMITTAL, no. 947686 registered on August 3, 2007, in classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant also owns a portfolio of domain names incorporating its ARCELORMITTAL trademark, including <arcelormittal.com>, which serves as its official global website.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on April 27, 2025. As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage.

There is no evidence of any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier well-known trademark ARCELORMITTAL, being used to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant, misleadingly and to take unfair advantage of the reputation of its marks.

Further, the Complainant submits that the addition of the term "corporate" and the letter "e" is not sufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity with the ARCELORMITTAL trademark. The Complainant also states that the Respondent is not authorized to use the Complainant's mark, has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and is not related in any way to the Complainant.

Additionally, the Complainant refers to earlier UDRP decisions in which the ARCELORMITTAL trademark was recognized as well known and distinctive.

The Complainant further asserts that it has no business relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent is neither an authorized distributor nor a licensee of the Complainant and has not been otherwise permitted to use its trademark.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name has been configured with active MX records, suggesting a potential for misuse in email communication.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules directs the Panel as to the principles to be applied in determining the dispute: “A Panel shall 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.”

The Policy provides, at paragraph 4(a), that each of the three elements must be made for a complaint to prevail:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, where a party does not comply with any provision of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate.

Considering the Parties’ submissions, the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, and applicable law, the Panel’s findings with respect to each of the above elements are set out below.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel further notes that a domain name consisting of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered confusingly similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. In particular, adding the letter “e” to the Complainant’s trademark ARCELORMITTAL in the disputed domain name <corporate-arceloremittal.com> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

Although the addition of a descriptive term, here “corporate”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Furthermore, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without the Complainant’s authorization or approval and is neither a distributor, partner, nor a licensee of the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website where no indication of bona fide offering of goods and services has been seen, which underlines the Panel’s view of no rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The disputed domain name almost entirely reproduces the Complainant’s well-known trademark ARCELORMITTAL, where the additional letter “e” in the disputed domain name <corporate-arceloremittal.com> is not material. The Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent arrived at the misspelled, distinctive, and lengthy trademark by mere coincidence. This indicates that the Respondent either knew or should have known the Complainant’s trademark and deliberately targeted it.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar, particularly domain names comprising typographical errors or incorporating the mark together with a descriptive term, such as “corporate” in this case, to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity, can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. The Panel shares this view.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive landing page, while MX records have been configured, suggesting that the disputed domain name may be used for phishing or other deceptive email-related purposes. These technical elements further reinforce the Panel's view that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds it highly unlikely that the adoption of a domain name incorporating a well-known and distinctive trademark such as ARCELORMITTAL was a mere coincidence. Given the well-known nature of the Complainant's trademark, it is implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without awareness of the Complainant's rights. This further supports the finding of bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <corporate-arceloremittal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dilek Zeybel/

Dilek Zeybel

Sole Panelist

Date: June 27, 2025