



DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE SUMMARY DECISION

James Hall v. Domain Admin

Case No. DUK2026-0019

1. The Parties

- 1.1. The Complainant is James Hall, United Kingdom, self-represented.
- 1.2. The Respondent is Domain Admin, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registry

- 2.1. The Registry of the disputed domain name <domilo.co.uk> is Nominet UK ("Nominet" or the "Registry").

3. Notification of Complaint

- 3.1. I hereby certify that I am satisfied that the Complaint has been sent to the Respondent in accordance with section 3 and 6 of the Policy.
☒ Yes ☐ No

4. Rights

- 4.1. The Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the disputed domain name.
☐ Yes ☒ No

5. Abusive Registration

- 5.1. The Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown that the disputed domain name <domilo.co.uk> is an abusive registration.
☐ Yes ☒ No

6. Other Factors

- 6.1. I am satisfied that no other factors apply which would make a summary decision unconscionable in all the circumstances.
☒ Yes ☐ No

7. Comments

- 7.1. The Complainant complains of the registration of the disputed domain name <domilo.co.uk> (the “Domain Name”). The Nominet register shows that the Domain Name was registered on July 27, 2026 through the registrar Namecheap, Inc. t/a Spaceship, and Nominet has confirmed that the registrant is “Domain Admin”, with an address in Hong Kong, China. The Respondent has filed no Response. The Domain Name resolves to a landing page on the Atom.com marketplace announcing that “Domilo.co.uk is for sale”, with options to buy the Domain Name outright, to lease it or to make an offer; the Complainant states that the asking price is USD 1,999.
- 7.2. The Complainant asserts Rights in the name DOMILO. The evidence comprises a certificate of incorporation showing that Domilo Ltd, company number 17360870, was incorporated in England and Wales on July 24, 2026; a Certificate of Filing from the Intellectual Property Office for United Kingdom trade mark application No. UK00004421941, filed by Domilo Ltd on July 27, 2026, for the word mark “Domilo” in classes 9, 35, 42 and 44; and an order confirmation from IONOS dated July 24, 2026, which, the Complainant says, led him to believe that he had secured a domain name registration when he had not. The Complainant describes the incorporation and the application as genuine preparations for trade under the DOMILO name. There is no evidence of any trading, sales, customers, advertising or public recognition of the name. On the Complainant’s own evidence, the company was incorporated three days before the Domain Name was registered and the trade mark application was filed on the day of registration.
- 7.3. Paragraph 1 of the Policy provides that “Rights means rights enforceable by the Complainant, whether under English law or otherwise, and may include rights in descriptive terms which have acquired a secondary meaning”, and paragraph 2.2 requires the Complainant to prove that he has such Rights on the balance of probabilities. An application for a trade mark does not of itself constitute Rights: its validity has not been determined, and ordinarily it affords the applicant no legal right to prevent others from using the mark (Nominet DRS Experts’ Overview (the “Experts’ Overview”), section 2.6). Nor does the mere registration of a company name at Companies House of itself give rise to Rights; that is the consensus view of Experts, following the Appeal decision in DRS 16584 (polo.co.uk) (Experts’ Overview, section 2.10). Unregistered rights are ordinarily proved by evidence that the name has been used for a not insignificant period and to a not insignificant degree and is recognised by the purchasing trade or public as indicating the Complainant’s goods or services (Experts’ Overview, section 2.3). There is no such evidence here, and, the name having been adopted only days before the Domain Name was registered, there was no time in which such recognition could have been acquired. An unsuccessful attempt to register a domain name, however unfortunate, confers no rights in a name or mark. I note also that the company name and the application relied upon are those of Domilo Ltd, whereas the Complaint is brought by Mr Hall personally; the Complaint does not distinguish between them, and it is unnecessary for me to do so. I am not satisfied that the Complainant has Rights within the meaning of the Policy, and the Complaint fails under paragraph 2.1.1.
- 7.4. The question under paragraph 2.1.2, whether the Domain Name in the hands of the Respondent is an Abusive Registration, therefore does not arise. I add for completeness that the Complaint would in any event have faced a further difficulty. A finding that a domain name “was registered or otherwise acquired in a manner which, at the time when the registration or acquisition took place, took unfair advantage of or was unfairly detrimental to the Complainant’s Rights” (paragraph 1 of the Policy) ordinarily requires that the Respondent had the Complainant or its name in mind at the time of registration: see the Appeal decision in DRS 04331 (verbatim.co.uk) (Experts’ Overview, section 3.2). The Complaint offers nothing

to show that the Respondent knew of Domilo Ltd or of the DOMILO name beyond the proximity in time of the registration of the Domain Name to the incorporation of the company three days earlier. Nor is the offer of the Domain Name for sale to the public of itself evidence of abuse: trading in domain names for profit is of itself a lawful activity (paragraph 8.4 of the Policy; Experts' Overview, section 4.7). The Complainant invokes the factor now found in paragraph 5.1.1.1 of the Policy, but it is directed to a registration made primarily for the purpose of selling the Domain Name to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant, of which there is no evidence beyond the public listing.

- 7.5. A summary decision may be granted only where the Expert is satisfied as to both elements of paragraph 2.1 of the Policy, even where, as here, no Response has been filed (paragraph 12.5 of the Policy; Experts' Overview, section 9.21), and an unrepresented party is held to the same standard as any other (Experts' Overview, section 9.40).

8. Decision

- 8.1. For the foregoing reasons, I order that no action be taken in respect of the disputed domain name <domilo.co.uk>.

David L. Kreider

Expert

Date: September 16, 2026