

DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE

D00022996

Decision of Independent Expert (Summary Decision)

Thortech Ltd

and

Tristan Thorpe

1. The Parties:

Complainant: Thortech Ltd Unit 8 Lamby Way Rumney Cardiff CF3 2EQ United Kingdom

Respondent: Tristan Thorpe

Fulwood Lancashire PR2 3AX United Kingdom

2. The Domain Name:

thortech.co.uk

3. Notification of Complaint

UKMATTERS:58982776.1

	ereby certify that I am satisfied that Nominet has sent the complaint to the espondent in accordance with section 3 and 6 of the Policy.			
		X Yes	□ No	
4.	Rights			
	ne Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown rights in respect a name or mark which is identical or similar to the domain name.			
	2	X Yes	□ No	
5.	Abusive Registration			
	The Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown name thortech.co.uk is an abusive registration	Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown that the domain a thortech.co.uk is an abusive registration		
		□Yes	X No	
6.	Other Factors			
	I am satisfied that no other factors apply which would make decision unconscionable in all the circumstances	e a sum	nmary	
		X Yes	□ No	

7. Comments

Paragraph 1 of the Nominet DRS Policy defines (with emphasis added) an "Abusive Registration" as:

"A Domain Name which either:

- i 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; or
- ii is being or has been used in a manner which has taken **unfair** advantage of or has been **unfairly** detrimental to the Complainant's Rights."

In this case, the Domain Name was registered by Tristan Hope because his company name was Thortech Consultants Limited. Without any evidence to the contrary, this was a valid reason for registering the Domain Name and cannot therefore be said to have been unfair.

UKMATTERS:58982776.1

In addition, for the same reason there is nothing to suggest that any use which the Respondent has made of the Domain Name has been unfair. The fact that the Respondent's company has now been dissolved is not by itself sufficient to mean that any future use by the Respondent of the Domain Name will be unfair. Unless and until there is evidence that the Respondent is using the Domain Name in a way which takes unfair advantage of, or is unfairly detrimental, to the Complainant's rights in its name, the Domain Name is not an Abusive Registration. The position will be the same if the Respondent chooses not to make any future use of the Domain Name, having not originally registered it unfairly.

8. Decision

I refuse the Complainant's application for a summary decision. The domain name registration will therefore remain with the Respondent.

Signed: Dated: 16 October 2020

Jason Rawkins

UKMATTERS:58982776.1