

O-526-17

ORDER under the Companies Act 2006

In the matter of application

No. 1464 by Royal Canin SAS

For a change of company name of registration

No. 08822611

DECISION

The company name KAMA NUTRITION PET FOOD LIMITED has been registered since 20 December 2013.

By an application filed on 07 June 2017 (subsequently amended on 04 July 2017), Royal Canin SAS applied for a change of name of this registration under the provisions of section 69(1) of the Companies Act 2006 (the Act).

A copy of the application was sent by Royal Mail recorded delivery to the primary respondent's registered office on 12 July 2017, in accordance with rule 3(2) of the Company Names Adjudicator Rules 2008. On the same date, the Tribunal also wrote to Mr Guomin Huang to inform him that the applicant had requested that he be joined to the proceedings. On 21 August 2017, Mr Guomin Huang was joined as a co-respondent. On 19 September 2017, the parties were advised that, as no defence had been received to the application, the adjudicator may treat the application as not being opposed. A period of 14 days to request a hearing was allowed in relation to this matter. No request for a hearing was made.

The primary respondent did not file a defence within the two month period specified by the adjudicator under rule 3(3). Rule 3(4) states

“The primary respondent, before the end of that period, shall file a counter-statement on the appropriate form, otherwise the adjudicator may treat it as not opposing the application and may make an order under section 73(1).”

Under the provisions of this rule, the adjudicator may exercise discretion so as to treat the respondent as opposing the application. In this case I can see no reason to exercise such discretion and, therefore, decline to do so.

As the primary respondent has not responded to the allegations made, it is treated as not opposing the application. Therefore, in accordance with section 73(1) of the Act I make the following order:

- (a) KAMA NUTRITION PET FOOD LIMITED shall change its name **within one month** of the date of this order to one that is not an offending nameⁱ;

O-526-17

- (b) KAMA NUTRITION PET FOOD LIMITED and Mr Guomin Huang shall:
- (i) take such steps as are within their power to make, or facilitate the making, of that change;
 - (ii) not cause or permit any steps to be taken calculated to result in another company being registered with a name that is an offending name.

In accordance with s. 73(3) of the Act, this order may be enforced in the same way as an order of the High Court or, in Scotland, the Court of Session.

In any event, if no such change is made within one month of the date of this order, I will determine a new company name as per section 73(4) of the Act and will give notice of that change under section 73(5) of the Act.

All respondents, including individual co-respondents, have a legal duty under Section 73(1)(b)(ii) of the Companies Act 2006 not to cause or permit any steps to be taken calculated to result in another company being registered with an offending name; this includes the current company. *Non-compliance may result in an action being brought for contempt of court and may result in a custodial sentence.*

Royal Canin SAS has been successful as the application has not been defended. Accordingly, I have considered whether it is appropriate to make an award of costs in its favour. The following question is asked at box 7 of the statutory application form (CNA1):

“Did you contact the company/limited liability partnership in relation to this matter prior to filing the application? If so, when did you do so and what did you say to the company/limited liability partnership?”

The following answer was given to this question:

“No”

As Royal Canin SAS did not inform KAMA NUTRITION PET FOOD LIMITED of its intention to file the subject application with the Company Names Tribunal, it is not entitled to an award of costs.

Any notice of appeal against this decision to order a change of name must be given within one month of the date of this order. Appeal is to the High Court in England, Wales and Northern Ireland and to the Court of Session in Scotland.

O-526-17

The company adjudicator must be advised if an appeal is lodged, so that implementation of the order is suspended.

Dated this 19th day of October 2017

Beverley Hedley
Company Names Adjudicator

ⁱAn “offending name” means a name that, by reason of its similarity to the name associated with the applicant in which he claims goodwill, would be likely to be the subject of a direction under section 67 (power of Secretary of State to direct change of name), or to give rise to a further application under section 69.