

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ArcelorMittal v. jeong wonho (Korean: 정원호)

Case No. D2025-4898

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is jeong wonho (Korean: 정원호), Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arcelormittalai.com> is registered with Gabia, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 25, 2025. On November 25, 2025, the Center transmitted to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 26, 2025, the Registrar transmitted to the Center its verification response disclosing the registrant and its contact information for the disputed domain name, which differed from the “unknown” respondent stated in the Complaint. On November 28, 2025, the Center notified the Complainant, with a copy to the Respondent, of the registrant and its contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and invited the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. In the same correspondence, the Center also informed the Parties, in both English and Korean, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. The Center stated that if the Complainant wished English to be the language of the proceeding, it should include this request in the amended Complaint.

On December 1, 2025, the Respondent responded in Korean to the Center’s November 28, 2025 message to the Parties, and indicated its willingness to transfer the disputed domain name. On the same date, the Center replied in both English and Korean, with a copy to the Complainant, stating, “If the Parties wish to explore settlement options, the Complainant should submit a request for suspension by December 8, 2025 If no request for suspension is received, the proceeding will continue.”

Also on December 1, 2025, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint with the Center, and requested that English be the language of the proceeding.

On December 9, 2025, the Center contacted the Parties, asking the Complainant whether it wished to request a suspension or proceed with the proceeding. On December 9, 2025, the Complainant responded, "Please continue the procedure."

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, in both English and Korean, formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the amended Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on December 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was December 29, 2025. On December 10, 2025, the Respondent contacted the Center, stating its willingness to transfer the disputed domain name and requesting information on where to sign – in Korean, "어디에 사인을 해야 되는지만 쉽게 전달 부탁드립니다." On December 12, 2025, the Center, in both English and Korean, responded to the Respondent, with a copy to the Complainant, stating, "Please note that the Complainant did not wish to request a suspension for exploring settlement discussion and requested the Center to continue the proceeding." The Respondent contacted the Center again on December 15, 2025, and December 18, 2025, again asking where it should sign to complete the process.

On January 2, 2026, the Center notified the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment; the Center also noted that the due date for the Response was December 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Professor Ilhyung Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 2026. 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.

On January 20, 2026, the Respondent contacted the Center, this time in English, stating, "I mentioned that I'm transferring the domain. They're asking me to sign and send it, but where exactly should I sign[?]"

4. Factual Background

The Complainant identifies itself as "a world company specialized in steel producing" and "the largest steel producing company in the world and ... the 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 owns an International Registration for the ARCELORMITTAL mark (registration number 947,686, registered on August 3, 2007, designating multiple jurisdictions, including the Republic of Korea). It also owns multiple marks for ARCELORMITTAL in the United States of America (e.g., registration number 3,643,643, registered on June 23, 2009).

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <arcelormittal.com> (registered on January 27, 2006).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 20, 2025. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive site.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends principally that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a 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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith. In addition, the amended Complaint states, inter alia:

“[The Complainant] notably has offices in [the Republic of] Korea, where the Respondent is located”

“The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark ARCELORMITTAL”

“The Complainant’s trademark ARCELORMITTAL is widely known.”

“[G]iven the distinctiveness of the Complainant’s trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark.”

B. Respondent

Other than its messages to the Center on December 1, December 10, December 15, December 18, 2025, and January 20, 2026, the Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant’s contentions. Under paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a) of the Rules, the Panel may decide the dispute based on the Complaint. Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules allows the Panel to draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent’s lack of a responsive response.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

Paragraph 11(a) of the Rules provides that the language of the registration agreement shall be the language of the administrative proceeding, unless otherwise agreed by the parties or specified in the registration agreement. This provision also states that the determination of the proper language is “subject to the authority of the Panel ..., having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding”. Here, although the language of the Registration Agreement is Korean, the Complaint was filed in English.

The Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding, stating: “[T]he English language is the language most widely used in international relations and is one of the working languages of the Center;” “The disputed domain name is formed by words in Roman characters (ASCII) and not in Korean script;” and “In order to proceed in Korean, the Complainant would have had to retain specialized translation services at a cost very likely to be higher than the overall cost of these proceedings. The use of Korean in this case would therefore impose a burden on the Complainant which must be deemed significant in view of the low cost of these proceedings.”

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.

Here, in the Center’s notification to the Respondent of the Complaint and the amended Complaint, the Center informed the Respondent of the pertinent provisions of paragraph 11 of the Rules and the Complainant’s request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Center also explicitly stated (and provided a Korean translation for):

“Accordingly, the Respondent may submit any comments on the Complainant’s proposed language of the proceedings in its Response.

The Response may be filed in either Korean or English.

The Center will seek to appoint a Panel familiar with both languages mentioned above.”

The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant’s request that English be the language of the proceeding, and has not formally participated in the proceeding other than its multiple messages to the Center regarding its signing to transfer the disputed domain name.

Considering all relevant circumstances, the Panel determines that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant’s 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 “ai” may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Panel finds that the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, a technical registration requirement, is disregarded in the consideration of this element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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 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.

Here, the Complainant explicitly states that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the ARCELORMITTAL mark, and has met its initial burden of making a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The burden then shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate any such rights or legitimate interests. Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may demonstrate the Respondent’s 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 is unable to ascertain any evidence that would demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the disputed domain name "has been registered and is being used in bad faith". Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that can satisfy this element. 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.

The dispute domain name resolves to an inactive website. Panels have 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. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes especially the distinctiveness of the Complainant's prior registered trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name clearly targeting the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL mark, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. In these circumstances, the Panel concludes that the requisite bad faith element is present.

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 <arcelormittalai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ilhyung Lee/

Ilhyung Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: January 20, 2026