

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arcelormittal v. Eric Philipson
Case No. D2025-3470

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Eric Philipson, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arcelormittal-steels.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 27, 2025. On August 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 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 (“Protected Protected, Shield Whois”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 28, 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 August 28, 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 September 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on September 24, 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 one of the largest steel producing companies in the world, and is a market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging, with 57.9 million tons crude steel made in 2024. The Complainant is the owner of international trademark registration no. 947686, for ARCELORMITTAL, registered on August 3, 2007, in classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41, and 42. The Complainant is the registrant of the domain name <arcelormittal.com>, registered since January 27, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 25, 2025. The disputed domain name is inactive and does not resolve to an active page. The Complainant has provided evidence that MX servers for the disputed domain name have been configured to enable it to be used for email purposes.

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 trademark ARCELORMITTAL, as it is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "steels" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, is not related in any way to the Complainant, nor is the Respondent licensed or authorized to use the Complainant's trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is inactive, and the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the Complainant avers that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's distinctive and widely known mark. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name points to an inactive page, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name that would not be illegitimate. The Complainant submits that prior UDRP panels have held that the incorporation of a famous mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use. The Respondent has also set up the disputed domain name with MX records, which suggest that it may be actively used for email purposes.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 entirety of the mark of the ARCELORMITTAL mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here, the word "steels" and a hyphen, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements 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.

The Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, is not related in any way to the Complainant, nor is the Respondent licensed or authorized to use the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is inactive, and the Respondent has not come forward with any demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant acquired trademark rights in its ARCELORMITTAL mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the entire ARCELORMITTAL mark, while adding the generic term “steels”, which is related to the business of the Complainant. The Complainant is one of the largest steel producing companies in the world, and other UDRP panelists have found that the ARCELORMITTAL mark is well-known. See *Arcelormittal v. Eric Philipson*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0638](#). It is implausible that the Respondent would not have been aware of, and targeting, the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name.

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.

UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registrations. This may include a scenario where a respondent, on separate occasions, has registered trademark abusive domain names, even where directed at the same brand owner. The Panel’s search of the WIPO UDRP Panel Decisions database return results reflecting that the Respondent has been found to have registered and used other ARCELORMITTAL domain names in bad faith including in three prior decisions, namely, *Arcelormittal v. Eric Philipson*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0638](#), *Arcelormittal v. Eric Philipson*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0941](#), and *Arcelormittal v. Eric Philipson*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4410](#). The Panel finds that the Respondent has repeatedly shown a bad faith pattern of targeting the Complainant in their abusive domain name registrations of “arcelormittal” related domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

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 and reputation of the Complainant’s ARCELORMITTAL trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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.

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 <arcelormittal-steels.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gary Saposnik/

Gary Saposnik

Sole Panelist

Date: October 8, 2025