

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ArcelorMittal v. Saeid Ahmadi

Case No. DCO2025-0046

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Saeid Ahmadi, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <steelmittal.co> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2025. On June 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 23, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Scott R. Austin as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 Complaint (as amended) and the evidence of record submitted in its attached Annexes, which have not been contested by Respondent, is sufficient to support the following facts.

Complainant is the largest steel producing company in the world and is the market leader in steel for use in automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging, producing 57.9 million tons of crude steel in 2024 under the trademarks MITTAL and MITTAL STEEL (the “MITTAL Marks”). Complainant manufactures steel in 15 countries for customers located in 129 countries and as of December 31, 2024, had over 125,000 employees worldwide.

Complainant owns registrations around the world for the MITTAL Marks identifying its steel products, including International Trademark No. 1198046, MITTAL, registered December 5, 2013, and European Union Trademark Registration No.4233301, MITTAL STEEL, registered March 27, 2006.

Complainant also shows that prior panels have found the MITTAL Marks well-known and widely used (see e.g., *Arcelormittal v. Mesotek Software Solutions Pvt. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-2049](#)).

Complainant owns a portfolio of numerous domain names incorporating the MITTAL Marks, including <mittalsteel.com>, registered since January 3, 2003, as well as its official domain name <arcelormittal.com> used to access its official website at “www.arcelormittal.com” which provides information promoting its steel products (the “Official MITTAL Marks Website”).

The disputed domain name was registered on June 8, 2025, and when accessed as of the date of the filing of the Complaint resolved to the website of a company using the name and logo “Steel Mittal” “founded in 2010” in Iran (Islamic Republic of) which purportedly sells seamless pipes in competition with Complainant, which shows seamless carbon steel pipe among the products displayed on the Official MITTAL Marks Website. However, the URL for the website originally accessed through the disputed domain name is currently inactive and the disputed domain name now redirects to a website for what appears to be the same company but using the name and logo “Manis Steel”, “founded in 2018” in Iran (Islamic Republic of) and purportedly selling seamless carbon steel pipe. The servers associated with the disputed domain name have also been configured with MX records to send and receive email.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark; that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent from the terms of the Policy that Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer or cancel a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof under the Policy is often expressed as the “balance of the probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence” standard. Under this standard, an asserting party needs to establish that it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.2.

Thus, for Complainant to succeed it must prove within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
2. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
3. The disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has met its burden in all three elements of the Policy and will deal with each of these elements in more detail below.

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 Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. Trademark registration evidence has been submitted in the form of electronic copies of valid and subsisting national and international trademark registration documents in the name of Complainant referenced in Section 4 above. Ownership of a nationally registered trademark constitutes prima facie evidence that the complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1; see *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#); see also *Janus International Holding Co. v. Scott Rademacher*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0201](#).

The Panel finds Complainant’s foregoing national and international registrations are sufficient to demonstrate statutory trademark rights in Complainant’s MITTAL Mark and MITTAL STEEL Mark to meet Complainant’s burden under the first element of the Policy.

A side-by-side comparison between the disputed domain name and Complainant’s mark shows the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s MITTAL Mark and MITTAL STEEL Mark.

Complainant’s MITTAL Mark is incorporated in its entirety in the disputed domain name except for Respondent appending the term “steel” before the Mark and followed by the official registered country-code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) “.co” designated as the country code for Colombia. Complainant shows that this ccTLD is also often used for its abbreviation of the standard business term “company.”

Prior panels have held in similar circumstances “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing”. See *L’Oréal, Lancôme Parfums et Beauté & Cie v. Jack Yang*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1627](#); see also, *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#).

Although the addition of the other term here, “steel”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the MITTAL Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Complainant also shows that the disputed domain name must be considered confusingly similar to Complainant’s MITTAL STEEL Mark because reversing the two terms comprising a Complainant’s trademark, has been specifically held by prior panels as not preventing a finding of confusing similarity. See *Crédit Agricole S.A. contre Marc Egnon*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0903](#).

Prior panels have also found that a ccTLD, being viewed as a standard registration requirement, may typically be disregarded under the paragraph 4(a)(i) analysis. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1; see also *The Manufacturers Life Insurance Company v. WhoisGuard, Inc. / hww toolz, director* WIPO Case No. [DCO2021-0009](#); *Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Sheppard Stetve*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2015-0007](#).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant must show that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Respondent may establish a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following:

“(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

It is well-established that the burden of proof lies on Complainant. However, satisfying the burden of proving a lack of Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is potentially onerous, since proving a negative can be difficult considering such information is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent.

Accordingly, in line with previous UDRP decisions, it is sufficient that Complainant show a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of production on Respondent. If Respondent fails to rebut Complainant’s prima facie case in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or on any other basis, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The panel finds here that Complainant has made a prima facie case and Respondent has failed to provide any response that could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the record here, there is no relationship between Complainant and Respondent and Complainant has not authorized Respondent to register or use its MITTAL Marks or the disputed domain name.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer a Respondent’s right over the disputed domain name, or that Respondent, whose name disclosed in the Registrar’s Whois records for the disputed domain name is Saeid Ahmadi, might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

As mentioned above, Respondent has used the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant's trademark to resolve or redirect users to Respondent's website where Respondent purportedly offers products in competition with products sold by Complainant. The Panel notes that both the initial website accessed through the disputed domain name and the subsequent site to which the disputed domain name now redirects since the filing of the Complaint shows Respondent's company's activity includes the purported sale of steel pipe products in competition with the steel pipe products that Complainant has been selling around the world under its registered and well-known MITTAL Marks for decades prior to Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name in 2025.

In view of the above, the Panel finds that Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, since the circumstances of the case suggest that Respondent, on balance of probabilities, registered and used the disputed domain name for the purpose of trading upon the fame of Complainant's MITTAL Marks.

In addition, the Panel finds that Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, since Respondent has clearly aimed at gaining revenues e.g., from the purported commercial sale of its steel products displayed on Respondent's website to which users are redirected by the disputed domain name incorporating the MITTAL Marks.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 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 also 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.

Complainant contends that Respondent's configuration of the disputed domain name demonstrates a knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant's well-known brand and business by registering a domain name that incorporates the MITTAL Mark in its entirety with the addition of the term "steel" appended in front of Complainant's mark.

Complainant shows that prior panels have found Complainant's MITTAL Marks to be well known and widely used. See *ArcelorMittal S.A. v. Registrant of lakshmimittal.org, c/o WHOISt trustee.com Limited / Zeus Holding Market Ltd.* WIPO Case No. [D2018-1086](#); *Arcelormittal v. Mesotek Software Solutions Pvt. Ltd.* WIPO Case No. [D2010-2049](#).

Complainant contends such configuration also shows Respondent's intent to create a false association in the minds of consumers between Respondent's seamless carbon steel pipe products and Complainant's MITTAL Mark seamless steel pipe products because it is implausible that Respondent was not aware of Complainant's MITTAL Mark and its association with such steel pipe products shown on Complainant's Official MITTAL Mark Website. The Panel notes there can be no doubt of Respondent's knowledge of Complainant's mark since Complainant shows that Respondent sells (or at least, claimed to sell) seamless carbon steel pipe products which are competing with the Complainant's products.

It is, therefore, reasonable for the panel to conclude that Respondent has intentionally created and registered the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark, as well as its official domain name, to redirect users to its website and sell competing products for its commercial benefit.

Prior panels have also held where the disputed domain name is configured in a manner to wholly incorporate a complainant's mark, as Complainant's Mark is incorporated here, with an added term, "steel", related to Complainant's industry in which Complainant is known worldwide as a leading manufacturer of steel products, the disputed domain name can only sensibly refer to Complainant; thus, there is no obvious possible justification for Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name other than registration in bad faith. See *Frankie Shop LLC v. Bgeew Aferg*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3619](#).

As discussed in greater detail in Section 6.B above, Complainant shows in evidence in the Annexes to its Complaint that Respondent is using the disputed domain name to create a likelihood of confusion with Complainant and thereby intentionally attract Internet users seeking Complainant's products to Respondent's website to purportedly sell competing seamless carbon steel pipe products, which constitutes evidence of bad faith use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See also *FC2, Inc. v. 申昌兰 (Shen Chang Lan)*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4590](#); *Karl Lagerfeld B.V. v. Hongdong Hu*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4375](#).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant, targeted Complainant's mark and used its actual knowledge to configure a website to attract Internet users for its commercial advantage. Accordingly, 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 <steelmittal.co> be transferred to Complainant.

/Scott R. Austin/

Scott R. Austin

Sole Panelist

Date: August 13, 2025