

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arcelormittal v. Maqsood Khan, Alifiya Tours & Travels
Case No. D2026-2955

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Maqsood Khan, Alifiya Tours & Travels, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arcelormittalinformationstechnology.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Gransy, s.r.o. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 6, 2026. On July 6, 2026, the Center sent an email to the Registrar, requesting for verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 7, 2026, the Registrar replied to the Center via email, disclosing the registrant’s information which differed from the named Respondent (NOT IDENTIFIED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on July 8, 2026, providing the registrant’s information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint by July 13, 2026. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 8, 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 July 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Duy Khanh Nguyen as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 is a market leader in steel for use in the automotive, construction, household appliances, and packaging sectors. It also holds sizeable captive supplies of raw materials and operates extensive distribution networks worldwide.

The Complainant owns the ARCELORMITTAL trademark (the “ARCELORMITTAL Trademark”), including the following registrations:

- International Registration No. 947686, registered on August 3, 2007, in respect of goods and services in classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41, 42;
- Indian Trademark Registration No. 1624297, registered on November 23, 2007, in respect of goods and services in classes 6, 12, 21, 40.

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <arcelormittal.com>, which was created on January 27, 2006.

The Disputed Domain Name was created on July 2, 2026. As of the date of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive page. According to the evidence brought before the Panel, the Disputed Domain Name previously resolved to a parking page with commercial links.

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.

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL Trademark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term “information technology”. The Complainant also contends that the Top-Level Domain “.com” may be disregarded.

The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, as it was never licensed or authorised to use the ARCELORMITTAL Trademark or apply for registration of the Disputed Domain Name by the Complainant. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant and is not known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent previously used the Disputed Domain Name to host a parking page with commercial links, which does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL Trademark is widely known, especially in India, the Respondent's location, where the Complainant operates via several subsidiaries. Therefore, the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name in full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant further submits that the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a parking page with commercial links, which shows that the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by capitalizing on the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL Trademark.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name combines the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL Trademark in its entirety with the terms "information technology". In this context, the Panel finds that the addition of the term "information technology" in the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL Trademark for the purpose of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In addition, it is well-established that the Top-Level Domain ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and thus is disregarded for this purpose. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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 Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL Trademark is well-known and has been registered and used for many years preceding the date of the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has never carried out any activity, business with or been related in any way to the Respondent. Besides, the Complainant has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the ARCELORMITTAL Trademark or apply for registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

Further, the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Whois information identifies the registrant as "Maqsood Khan" and the registrant organization as "Alifiya Tours & Travels", neither of which corresponds to the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel also considers the Complainant's submission that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a parking page with commercial links, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use. According to the material brought before the Panel (Annex 6), the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website containing "Yahoo-Related Search Topics" labelled "Arcelor", "Mittal", and "Information_technology", which is consistent with a parking page and may indicate a pay-per-click ("PPC") search-link arrangement.

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary from the Respondent, this is sufficient to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent was not using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate non-commercial or fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, which establishes the second element of the Policy.

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.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In this case, the Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 2, 2026, long after the Complainant registered the ARCELORMITTAL Trademark. Given that the distinctive and well-known character of the ARCELORMITTAL Trademark has been established under numerous UDRP decisions (see *Arcelormittal v. Eric Philipson*, Case No. [D2024-0638](#); *ArcelorMittal SA v. Tina Campbell*, Case No. [DCO2018-0005](#)), it is implausible that the registration of the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates the ARCELORMITTAL Trademark in its entirety, was coincidental.

The Panel considers the Complainant's evidence that, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website containing "Yahoo-Related Search Topics" named "Arcelor", "Mittal", and "Information_technology". This appears to be a website with automatically generated PPC links. The Panel therefore finds the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <arcelormittalinformationtechnology.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Duy Khanh Nguyen/

Duy Khanh Nguyen

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2026