

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arcelormittal v. liza Jose Lisa Jose
Case No. D2026-1813

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is liza Jose Lisa Jose, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arcelormittael.com> is registered with Gandi SAS (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 28, 2026. On April 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 29, 2026, 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 April 30, 2026, 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 May 4, 2026.

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 May 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Aaron Newell as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is one of the largest steel producing companies in the world, and a market leader in steel for the automotive, construction, household appliance and packaging sectors. It has traded by reference to the name ArcelorMittal since around 2006.

The Complainant owns a number of registered trademark rights in its ARCELORMITTAL brand including:

- i) United States Trademark Registration No. 3908649 for ARCELORMITTAL, filed April 20, 2009, and registered January 18, 2011, in class 37; and
- ii) United States Trademark Registration No. 3643643 for ARCELORMITTAL, filed August 3, 2007, and registered June 23, 2009, in classes 6, 39, 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant promotes its business online at the website “www.arcelormittal.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered April 23, 2026. At the time that the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a domain name parking page advising that the domain name had been registered with the Registrar. This remains the case at the time of this Decision.

There is nothing in the available record to indicate that the Respondent engaged with the Center, the Complainant or these proceedings generally.

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:

- i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered ARCELORMITTAL trademark because it only differs from this trademark by way of an additional letter “e” directly before the final letter “l”;
- ii) the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, is not authorized by the Complainant to use its trademarks or confusingly similar marks and does not carry out any activity for nor have any business with the Complainant, and that the disputed domain name is an example of typosquatting being the practice of registering a domain name in order to take advantage of typographical errors made by Internet users; and
- iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because it was registered in full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in its ARCELORMITTAL trademark, is an intentional misspelling of this trademark and therefore evidences an intention to confuse Internet users, been set up with an active mail exchange (“MX”) record which suggests it could be used for email and, given the fame of the Complainant, and because there is no plausible good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which it has rights;
- ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant.

Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules does however provide that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a response as it considers appropriate.

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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

That trademark is entirely reproduced in the disputed domain name albeit with an intentional misspelling. As a typographical variant on the Complainant's trademark, the Panel finds the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to that trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 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.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

This is the situation in the present matter. The Complainant's trademark has been in use for approximately two decades and is well known in its industry, and is a coined term. The disputed domain name is considered a typographical variant of the Complainant's trademark. It is accordingly evident from the disputed domain name itself that the Respondent targeted the Complainant with an intention to mislead Internet users, and that there is no conceivable good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put in the hands of the Respondent. Considering the above, and also the Respondent's silence in these proceedings, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Therefore, the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <arcelormittael.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Aaron Newell/

Aaron Newell

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2026