



DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE SUMMARY DECISION

Lexington Mig Group Ltd v. Domain Admin

Case No. DUK2026-0051

1. The Parties

- 1.1. The Complainant is Lexington Mig Group Ltd, United Kingdom, represented internally.
- 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 <crapbag.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 sections 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 <crapbag.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 <crapbag.co.uk> (the "Domain Name"). The Nominet register shows that the Domain Name was registered on August 6, 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 "CrapBag.co.uk is for sale", with options to buy it outright for USD 1,999, to lease it or to make an offer; a 123-reg listing in evidence offers it at GBP 1,476.03.
- 7.2. The Complainant asserts Rights in the name CRAP BAG. The Complaint described the Complainant as the registered proprietor of United Kingdom trade mark No. UK00004426789, a description the Complainant corrected by e-mail on August 27, 2026. The evidence comprises a Certificate of Filing from the Intellectual Property Office for an application, filed by the Complainant on August 6, 2026, to register the word mark "Crap Bag" in classes 16 and 21 for pet waste bags and related goods, and the Office's letter of August 13, 2026 accepting it for publication; screenshots of an Instagram account named "crapbag.co.uk", shown as having joined Instagram in January 2024, with six posts and 29 followers; and four undated packaging designs for dog waste bags under the name "crap bag", which carry the Domain Name. The application has since been published, the Complainant says, and the opposition period is open. The Complainant describes itself as having been "actively developing and promoting the CRAPBAG brand". There is no evidence that any product has been made or sold, or of customers, turnover, advertising, press coverage or a website.
- 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 it has such Rights on the balance of probabilities. The threshold is a modest one (Nominet DRS Experts' Overview (the "[Experts' Overview](#)"), section 2.3), but bare assertions will rarely suffice ([Experts' Overview](#), section 2.2). An application for a trade mark does not of itself constitute Rights, although an applicant may be able to show separate unregistered rights in the mark ([Experts' Overview](#), section 1.9). 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 ([Experts' Overview](#), section 2.2). An Instagram account with six posts and 29 followers shows neither use to a not insignificant degree nor recognition of the name by the public, and the undated packaging designs evidence an intention to trade under the name rather than trade itself. The Complainant has, on its own description, been developing a brand; a brand in development is not yet a right that the law will enforce, and the application had not proceeded to registration at the date of the Complaint. 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 difficulties. 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 2.4). The Complaint rests on timing: a registration said to have been made the day after the application was filed, and three other .co.uk names matching third-party applications filed on August 6, 2026, registered through the same registrar and offered at the same price. The register shows that the Domain Name was registered at 08:44 UTC on August 6, 2026, the day of the application itself, and the record does not show at what time that day the application was filed or became publicly visible. The lookups for the other names do not identify their registrants, as paragraph 5.1.3 of the Policy would require, and one of them, <cozytuft.co.uk>, appears from the Complainant’s own lookup to pre-date the application it is said to match. 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 3.2), and paragraph 5.1.1.1 of the Policy, which the Complaint invokes, is directed to a registration made primarily to sell the Domain Name to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant, of which there is no evidence beyond the public listing. Whether the coincidence of dates would nonetheless have satisfied me that the Respondent had the Complainant’s name in mind, I do not need to decide.

- 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](#), sections 5.13 and 5.6), and, as a general rule, an unrepresented party is held to the same standard as any other ([Experts’ Overview](#), section 5.11).

8. Decision

- 8.1. For the foregoing reasons, the Expert orders that no action be taken in respect of the disputed domain name <crabag.co.uk>.

David L. Kreider
Expert

Date: October 12, 2026