nominet*

DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE

D00013012

Decision of Independent Expert (Summary Decision)

Maplin Electronics Limited

and

Ronny Schmidt

1. The Parties:

Lead Complainant: Maplin Electronics Limited Brookfields Way Manvers Wath Upon Dearne Rotherham South Yorkshire S63 5DL United Kingdom

Respondent: Ronny Schmidt Marktstrasse 1 Gaegelow DE 23968 Germany

2. The Domain Name(s):

maplinsjobs.co.uk

3. Notification of Complaint

	I hereby certify that I am satisfied that Nominet has sent the complaint to the respondent in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 4 of the
	Procedure. X Yes□ No
4.	Rights
	The complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown Rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the Domain name.
	X Yes□ No
5.	Abusive Registration
	The complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown that the domain name maplinsjobs.co.uk is an Abusive Registration
	X Yes□ No
6.	Other Factors
	I am satisfied that no other factors apply which would make a summary decision unconscionable in all the circumstances
	X Yes□ No
7.	
7.	
7.	Comments (optional) The finding of Abusive Registration is based on the complainant's submissions under clause 3(a)(i)(C) of the Policy (unfair disruption to the
7.	Comments (optional) The finding of Abusive Registration is based on the complainant's submissions under clause 3(a)(i)(C) of the Policy (unfair disruption to the complainant's business). The complainant's submissions under clause 3 (iii) of the Policy are noted but they are insufficient in themselves to prove a <i>pattern</i> of registrations of
7.	Comments (optional) The finding of Abusive Registration is based on the complainant's submissions under clause 3(a)(i)(C) of the Policy (unfair disruption to the complainant's business). The complainant's submissions under clause 3 (iii) of the Policy are noted but they are insufficient in themselves to prove a <i>pattern</i> of registrations of names in which the respondent has no apparent rights.
	Comments (optional) The finding of Abusive Registration is based on the complainant's submissions under clause 3(a)(i)(C) of the Policy (unfair disruption to the complainant's business). The complainant's submissions under clause 3 (iii) of the Policy are noted but they are insufficient in themselves to prove a <i>pattern</i> of registrations of names in which the respondent has no apparent rights.
	Comments (optional) The finding of Abusive Registration is based on the complainant's submissions under clause 3(a)(i)(C) of the Policy (unfair disruption to the complainant's business). The complainant's submissions under clause 3 (iii) of the Policy are noted but they are insufficient in themselves to prove a <i>pattern</i> of registrations of names in which the respondent has no apparent rights. Decision
	Comments (optional) The finding of Abusive Registration is based on the complainant's submissions under clause 3(a)(i)(C) of the Policy (unfair disruption to the complainant's business). The complainant's submissions under clause 3 (iii) of the Policy are noted but they are insufficient in themselves to prove a pattern of registrations of names in which the respondent has no apparent rights. Decision Transfer X No action

Signe: Sallie Spilsbury Dated: 28th July 2013

