

ORDER under the Companies Act 2006

In the matter of application

No. 1424 by Hugo Boss UK Limited

For a change of company name of registration

No. 10179672

DECISION

The company name BOSS ROBES LTD has been registered since 13 May 2016 under number 10179672.

By an application filed on 3 May 2017, Hugo Boss UK Limited 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 this application was sent to the primary respondent's registered office on 20 June 2017, in accordance with rule 3(2) of the Company Names Adjudicator Rules 2008. The copy of the application was sent by Royal Mail special delivery. On the same date, the Tribunal wrote to Andrew Joseph Hart to inform him that the applicant had requested that he be joined to the proceedings. No comments were received from Mr Hart in relation to this request. On 5 September 2017, Andrew Joseph Hart was joined as a co-respondent. On the same date, the parties were advised that no defence had been received to the application and so the adjudicator may treat the application as not being opposed. The parties were granted a period of 14 days to request a hearing in relation to this matter, if they so wished. No request for a hearing was made.

The primary respondent did not file a defence within the one 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) BOSS ROBES LTD shall change its name **within one month** of the date of this order to one that is not an offending name¹;
- (b) BOSS ROBES LTD and Andrew Joseph Hart each shall:
 - (i) take such steps as are within their power to make, or facilitate the making, of that change;
 - (ii) not to 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.*

Although the applicant requested its costs in its statement of case, the application did not indicate that an application to the Tribunal would ensue if the name was not changed. The pre-action correspondence referred to the respondent's trade mark application, infringement and passing off. The trade mark application was subsequently withdrawn. An opportunity was given, by way of a letter dated 11 October 2017 to the applicant to comment on the Tribunal's view that it was not entitled to its costs. No response has been received to this letter. As such, I make no award of costs in its favour.

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.

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

Dated this 21st day of December 2017

Judi Pike
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.