

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ArcelorMittal (Société Anonyme) v. Pedro Henrique Queiroz
Case No. D2025-4552

1. The Parties

Complainant is ArcelorMittal (Société Anonyme), Luxembourg, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Pedro Henrique Queiroz, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arcelormittallbrasil.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 4, 2025. On November 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 6, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 11, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 2, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on December 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on December 8, 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

Complainant is one of the world's leading steel companies, also manufacturing household products, and listed on the New York Stock Exchange among other international exchanges.

Complainant owns many registrations globally for its ARCELORMITTAL marks, including for example: Brazilian Trademark Registration No. 829481621, registered in International Class 40 on December 23, 2014; Brazilian Trademark Registration No. 829481605, registered in International Class 21 on December 23, 2014; and United States of America Trademark Registration No. 3908649, registered in International Class 37 on January 18, 2011.

Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <arcelormittal.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 12, 2025. The disputed domain name has resolved at various times to different webpages: (1) before filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage that prominently displayed Complainant's trademarks and logo, used Complainant's orange and white color scheme, and impersonated Complainant; (2) at the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive webpage; and (3) presently, the webpage to which disputed domain name resolves is blocked by a built-in browser security feature, displaying the message "dangerous site", because the webpage has been reported as containing unsafe content and phishing links.

Two recent UDRP decisions were rendered against Respondent in the Czech Arbitration Court (CAC). Both were brought by Complainant and involved intentional misspelling (or typosquatting), with disputed domain names found to be confusingly similar to Complainant's marks: *ARCELORMITTAL v. Pedro Henrique Queiroz*, CAC Case No. 107900 (<arcelormiittalbrasil.com>); and *ARCELORMITTAL v. Pedro Henrique Queiroz*, CAC Case No. 107986 (<mittalbrasiil.com>).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant notes that this is a case of improper typosquatting since the composition of the dispute domain name includes an extra letter "l" at the end of Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark.

Complainant avers that it was formed in 2006 and is currently one of the world's leading steel and mining companies, with over 125,000 employees and manufacturing steel in 15 countries to serve customers in 129 countries.

Complainant further avers that "Complainant is the largest steel producer in Brazil, with [...] 17,000 employees. Complainant operates in Brazil under its wholly-owned subsidiary 'ArcelorMittal Brasil S.A.'."

Complainant alleges that Respondent first used the disputed domain name for a website displaying Complainant's logo and trademarks until Complainant requested its "takedown" (presumably via the Registrar), after which the disputed domain name resolved to a blank webpage.

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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 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.

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 is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with an extra letter "l". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7; see also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9 ("A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element").

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

The Panel finds that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 which 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 Panel accepts Complainant's unopposed allegations that Respondent has no authorization or affiliation that would permit Respondent to use Complainant's marks in the disputed domain name and that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of Policy paragraph 4(a) has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances 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 Panel notes that the confusingly similar disputed domain name was registered after Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademarks had been in widespread international use for many years. Without authorization, Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that impersonates Complainant's business, clearly targeting Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, alleged impersonation/passing off or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark in the sense of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Prior UDRP proceedings between these same parties have found Respondent to have registered and used in bad faith domain names that are simple misspellings or typosquatting of Complainant's trademarks, also apparently targeting Complainant in the Brazilian market. The Panel finds that Respondent's bad faith is also established under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy (a respondent's pattern of abusive registrations may be evidence of bad faith for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <arcelormittallbrasil.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/

Jeffrey D. Steinhardt

Sole Panelist

Date: December 16, 2025