

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arcelormittal v. Veronica Julius

Case No. D2025-4653

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Veronica Julius, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arcelormittal.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 November 10, 2025. On November 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 12, 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 (Shield Whois) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 13, 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 November 14, 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 November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Eva Fiammenghi 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, ArcelorMittal, is a multinational corporation headquartered in Luxembourg and recognized as one of the world's leading steel and mining companies. Established in 2006 following the merger of Arcelor and Mittal Steel, the Complainant operates in over 60 countries, employing approximately 125,000 people. Its core business includes the production and supply of steel and related products for automotive, construction, energy, and packaging industries. The Complainant emphasizes innovation and sustainability, holding more than 930 active patent families and over 200 registered trademarks worldwide.

The Complaint is based on the Complainant's registered trademark ARCELORMITTAL, which is widely known and used in connection with steel manufacturing and related services. Relevant trademark registration includes:

- International Registration No. 0947686, ARCELORMITTAL, registered on August 3, 2007, for goods and services in Classes 06, 07, 09, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41 and 42.

The Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <arcelormittal.com>, registered on January 27, 2006, which serves as its official corporate website.

The disputed domain name <arcelormittal.com> was registered on November 5, 2025. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, and the Mail Exchange ("MX") servers are configured.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <arcelormittal.com> is confusingly similar to its well-known trademark ARCELORMITTAL. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name reproduces its trademark almost in its entirety, with only a minor typographical variation, the addition of an extra letter "l", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized to use its trademark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial use.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The registration occurred in November 2025, long after the Complainant's trademarks became internationally famous. While the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, DNS records show active MX entries, indicating that the disputed domain name is configured for email services. The Complainant argues that this strongly suggests an intent to use the domain name for fraudulent purposes, such as phishing or impersonation, by exploiting the similarity to the Complainant's trademark. In the Complainant's view, these circumstances demonstrate bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

On this basis, the Complainant requests that the Panel order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed a complainant must prove that:

- (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; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

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 disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark ARCELOREMITTAL almost in its entirety, with only a minor typographical variation (the addition of an extra letter "l"), which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Misspellings of a trademark, such as in this case, are commonly referred to as "typosquatting" and do not avoid confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The applicable generic Top-Level Domain (".com") is typically disregarded under the first element assessment. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there evidence of any *bona fide* offering of goods or services, or legitimate noncommercial use. On the contrary, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, and DNS records show active MX entries, suggesting potential use for fraudulent email activities.

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 in November 2025, many years after the Complainant's trademark ARCELORMITTAL became internationally well known. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark almost in its entirety, with only a minor typographical variation, which strongly suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, as confirmed by the evidence provided, but DNS records show active MX entries, indicating that the disputed domain name is configured for email services and might be used for illegitimate activity. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have also found that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. In this case, the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, combined with the composition of the disputed domain name and the presence of MX records, reinforce 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 <arcelormittal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Eva Fiammenghi/
Eva Fiammenghi
Sole Panelist
Date: December 29, 2025