

O-137-18

ORDER under the Companies Act 2006

In the matter of application No. 1389

By Henkel Limited

for a change of company name of registration

No. 10039870

DECISION

The company name UNIBOND TRADE LIMITED has been registered since 3 March 2016.

By an application filed on 27 February 2017, Henkel 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 21 March 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. Also on 21 March 2017, the tribunal wrote to Yanqiu Wang to inform him that the applicant had requested that he be joined to the proceedings. No comments were received from Mr Wang in relation to this request.

On 15 June 2017, Mr Wang was joined as a co-respondent; he was granted a period of 14 days to request a hearing in relation to this matter. No request for a hearing was made. On the same date, the primary respondent and applicant 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; no request for a hearing was received.

On 13 July 2017, the tribunal wrote to the primary respondent and applicant. It explained that as an application had been made to strike-off the company, the application was potentially without object. The tribunal further explained that it was minded to suspend the application to await the outcome of the request to strike-off. The parties were allowed a period of 14 days to comment on the above approach. On 24 July 2017, the applicant indicated it was content with the tribunal's suggested approach; the primary respondent did not react to that letter.

On 31 July 2017, the tribunal wrote to the primary respondent and applicant again. It explained that the request to strike-off had been discontinued and the parties were allowed a further period of 14 days to request a hearing. No request for a hearing was received.

O-137-18

On 15 September 2017, the tribunal wrote to the co-respondent and applicant. It explained that as its letter of 31 July 2017 had not been copied to the co-respondent, a further period of 14 days was allowed for a hearing to be requested. No request for a hearing was received.

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) UNIBOND TRADE LIMITED shall change its name **within one month** of the date of this order to one that is not an offending nameⁱ;
- (b) UNIBOND TRADE LIMITED and Yanqiu Wang 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 section 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.*

O-137-18

Costs

Henkel Limited having been successful, is entitled to a contribution towards its costs. I order UNIBOND TRADE LIMITED and Yanqiu Wang being jointly and severally liable, to pay Henkel Limited costs on the following basis:

Fee for application: £400

Statement of case: £400

Total: £800

This sum is to be paid within seven days of the expiry of the appeal period or within seven days of the final determination of this case if any appeal against this decision is unsuccessful.

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 5th day of March 2018

Christopher Bowen
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.