

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-102161

Case number	CAC-UDRP-102161
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2018-09-18 09:46:05
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	uk-arcelormittal.com
--------------	----------------------

Case administrator

Name	Šárka Glasslová (Case admin)
------	------------------------------

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL S.A.
--------------	--------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Nameshield (Laurent Becker)
--------------	-----------------------------

Respondent

Name	james
------	-------

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings pending or decided which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the holder of trademark rights for the word mark ARCELORMITTAL, registered in numerous jurisdictions, including the United States (e.g. international registration No. 947686 since August 3, 2007, duly renewed, and covering products in classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41 and 42).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, ArcelorMittal S.A., is the world's largest steel producer. The Complainant produces and supplies steel for use in the automotive industry, construction, household appliances and packaging with operations in more than 60 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of the registered word mark ARCELORMITTAL in several classes in numerous countries all over the world, including the United States.

The disputed domain name has been registered on September 2, 2018 by the Respondent. The disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to trademarks in which it has rights. The Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent does not use the disputed domain name in connection with any legitimate use. Also, according to the Complainant, the Respondent has not been authorized to register or use the disputed domain name. Finally, the Complainant considers that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, of the existence of the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant further contends that the incorporation of the Complainant's famous trademark in the disputed domain name by the Respondent coupled with an inactive website evidences bad faith registration and use.

RESPONDENT:

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

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

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 the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the 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 a domain name. As the proceedings are civil, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

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

The Panel has therefore dealt with each of these requirements in turn.

1. Identity or confusing similarity

The Complainant must first establish that there is a trademark or service mark in which it has rights. Since the Complainant is the holder of the registered ARCELORMITTAL trademark, which is used in connection with its business, it is established that there is a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark in its entirety, merely adding a hyphen and the non-distinctive prefix "uk". the addition of the prefix "uk" does not add to the distinctiveness of the disputed domain name as it corresponds to the country code and abbreviation of the United Kingdom. The addition of a geographical term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (See section 1.8, WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0").

Additionally, it is well established that hyphens and the generic top-level suffix ".com" may be disregarded when considering whether the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. Accordingly, the Complainant has made out the first of the three elements that it must establish.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

It is established case law that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent (See *Champion Innovations, Ltd. V. Udo Dussling (45FHH)*, WIPO case No. D2005-1094; *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO case No. D2003-0455; *Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o.*, WIPO case No. 2004-0110).

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has not acquired trademark or service mark rights. The Respondent's use and registration of the disputed domain name was not authorized by the Complainant. There are no indications that a connection between the Complainant and the Respondent existed.

Moreover, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. In fact, the Respondent is not making any use of the disputed domain name. The passive holding or non-use of a domain name is, in appropriate circumstances, evidence of a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (see *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. D2011-2209; *American Home Products Corporation vs. Ben Malgioglio*, WIPO Case No. D2000-1602; *Vestel Elektronik Sanayi ve Ticaret AS v. Mehmet Kahveci*, WIPO Case No. D2000-1244).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case, which was not refuted, and that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Complainant has satisfied the second requirement that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. Bad faith

Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and that it is

being used in bad faith (See e.g. Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallow, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; Control Techniques Limited v. Lektronix Ltd, WIPO Case No. D2006-1052).

According to the Panel, the awareness of a respondent of the complainant and/or the complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration can evidence bad faith (see Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz, WIPO Case No. D2011-2209; Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite, WIPO Case No. D2001-1070). In the instant case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the ARCELORMITTAL trademark at the moment it registered the disputed domain name, since the Complainant's trademark is a widely known trademark, including in the United States where the Respondent is residing, and the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive ARCELORMITTAL trademark in its entirety.

The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name. According to the Panel, the passive holding of the disputed domain name may amount to bad faith when it is difficult to imagine any plausible future active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would be legitimate and not infringing the Complainant's well-known mark or unfair competition and consumer protection legislation (See Inter-IKEA v Polanski, WIPO Case No. D2000 1614; Inter-IKEA Systems B.V. v. Hoon Huh, WIPO Case No. D2000 0438; Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003).

The fact that a complainant's trademark has a strong reputation and is widely used and the absence of evidence whatsoever of any actual or contemplated good faith use are further circumstances that may evidence bad faith registration and use in the event of passive use of domain names (see section 3.3, WIPO Overview 3.0).

In the present case, the Panel is of the opinion that the Complainant's ARCELORMITTAL trademark is distinctive and widely used, which makes it difficult to conceive any plausible legitimate future use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

Therefore, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, it is sufficiently shown that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

- 1. **UK-ARCELORMITTAL.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Flip Petillion
------	----------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2018-10-24

Publish the Decision