

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arcelormittal v. zhang huan huan

Case No. D2025-4601

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is zhang huan huan, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mittalmetalhouse.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 6, 2025. On November 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 10, 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 November 10, 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 in English on November 10, 2025.

On November 10, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On the same day, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on December 15, 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 a company specialized in the production of steel worldwide. It operates under the name ArcelorMittal and maintains an online presence at "www.arcelormittal.com". The Complainant claims to be one of the largest steel producing companies in the world and is a market leader in steel products for use in the automotive, construction, household appliances, and packaging sectors. In 2024, the Complainant produced approximately 57.9 million tons of crude steel. It holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of an international trademark portfolio for trademark registrations incorporating the mark MITTAL, including but not limited to the following: European Union Trade mark Registration MITTAL, registration No. 3975786, registered on December 1, 2005; International Trademark Registration MITTAL, registration No. 1198046, registered on December 5, 2013. The Complainant also owns a substantial portfolio of domain names incorporating the term "mittal", including the domain name <mittalsteel.com>, which was registered on January 3, 2003.

The Panel notes that prior UDRP panels have accepted that the Complainant's MITTAL trademarks are well known. See, for example, *ArcelorMittal S.A. v. Registrant of lakshmimittal.org, c/o WHOIStrustee.com Limited / Zeus Holding Market Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1086](#), and *Arcelormittal v. Mesotek Software Solutions Pvt. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-2049](#).

The disputed domain name <mittalmetalhouse.com> was registered on July 11, 2025. The Complainant provides evidence that at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an error page.

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 MITTAL trademarks. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name contains its mark and that the addition of "metal" and "house" and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" does not prevent confusion with the Complainant or its trademarks.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has no relationship with the Complainant, and the disputed domain name resolves to an error page, demonstrating no bona fide use.

Finally, the Complainant essentially contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's well-known MITTAL trademarks and that the inactive use of the disputed domain name demonstrates bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that English is widely used in international relations and is one of the working languages of the Center; the disputed domain name is composed of words in Roman characters rather than Chinese script; and proceeding in Chinese would have required specialized translation services at a cost likely to exceed the overall cost of the proceedings, imposing a significant burden on the Complainant.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Findings on the Merits

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 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 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, "metal" and "house" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Moreover, upon review of the facts and evidence, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, is not licensed by the Complainant to use the MITTAL mark in any way and has not provided any evidence of the use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Additionally, the Panel finds that holding a domain name passively, without making any use of it, also does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

The Panel finds that 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 which contains the Complainant’s well-known mark in its entirety and that the Complainant’s mark was registered many years before the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that a simple Internet search or trademark search on the date of registration of the disputed domain name would have shown the Respondent that the Complainant owned prior registered trademark for MITTAL. Therefore, the Panel finds that by registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent deliberately and consciously targeted the Complainant’s prior well-known trademark for MITTAL. The Panel finds that this creates a presumption of bad faith. In the Panel’s view, the foregoing elements clearly indicate bad faith on the part of the Respondent, and the Panel therefore finds that it has been demonstrated that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 and well-known nature of the Complainant's 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 <mittalmetalhouse.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: December 22, 2025