DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE SUMMARY DECISION

Max Law Firm Limited v. Noel Hernandez
Case No. DUK2026-0029

1. The Parties

1.1. The Complainant is Max Law Firm Limited, United Kingdom, internally represented.

1.2. The Respondent is Noel Hernandez, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registry

2.1. The Registry of the disputed domain name <maxlawfirm.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. Abuse Registration

5.1. The Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown that the disputed domain name 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 (Optional)

The Expert notes for completeness that it was not persuaded by the Complainant's claim to unregistered Rights in the name or mark "Max Law Firm Limited" on the strength of its certificate of incorporation as a United Kingdom limited company under the corresponding name dated October 14, 2022 (or the limited additional materials produced by the Complainant. See section 2.2 of the Experts' Overview Version 3 (the "Experts' Overview") on the question of unregistered rights and the typical evidence required to demonstrate these). Furthermore, section 1.7 of the Experts' Overview answers the question "Can a company name registration (per se) give rise to a right within the definition of Rights?" by noting that although earlier decisions under the Policy went both ways, "The consensus view of recent Experts' meetings has been that mere registration of a company name at the Companies Registry does not of itself give rise to any rights for this purpose. An appeal panel in DRS 16584 (polo.co.uk) agreed with that approach".

The Expert however considered it likely that the Complainant or a director, shareholder, or parent entity would possess a registered trade mark for the term MAX LAW FIRM in light of the Complainant's evidence of the entry in the Switzerland Global Enterprise Expert Directory showing that it was part of a larger international network named "MAX LAW FIRM INTERNATIONAL". Following the reasoning in Chivas Brothers Limited *v.* David William Plenderleith, DRS 00292 the Expert decided to conduct some brief research in the WIPO Global Brand Database in respect of the claimed mark, and noted that Thailand Registered Trade Mark Number 231102086 for the device and word mark M, MAX LAW FIRM is registered to a Thailand-resident director of the Complainant (as listed in the Complainant's entry at United Kingdom Companies House). The Expert double-checked the existence of said mark in a third party database which provides a Thailand trade mark lookup.

This overseas right constitutes a relevant right within the definition of Rights under the Policy (see section 1.5 of the Experts' Overview). The Complainant's invoice number INV-2026-06-001 dated June 22, 2026 features both the device and words of the said registered trade mark and the mark is therefore in use by the Complainant (presumably under a de facto licence granted by its said director, who may be presumed to know of and have consented to such use). Consequently, the Expert is satisfied that the Complainant has Rights under the Policy on the strength of such registered trade mark. These Rights are similar to the disputed domain name.

The Expert is satisfied that the website associated with the disputed domain name targets the Rights which are used by a group or associate company whose business is disrupted (see section 1.1(b) of the Experts' Overview) and that the disputed domain name is therefore an Abusive Registration.

8. Decision

8.1. In accordance with paragraph 18 of the Policy, the Expert orders that the disputed domain name <maxlawfirm.co.uk> be transferred to the Complainant.

Andrew D. S. Lothian
Expert
Date: September 21, 2026