

DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE

D00028377

**Decision of Independent Expert
(Summary Decision)**

Quick Loans Ltd

and

Casheuronet UK , LLC

1. The Parties:

Complainant: Quick Loans Ltd
Vicarage Chambers
9 Park Square East
Leeds
Yorkshire
LS1 2LH
United Kingdom

Respondent: Casheuronet UK , LLC
483 Green Lanes Suite 2400
London
IL
N13 4BS
United Kingdom

2. The Domain Name:

quickquid.uk

3. Notification of Complaint

I hereby certify that I am satisfied that Nominet has sent the complaint to the Respondent in accordance with section 3 and 6 of the Policy.

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.

Yes No

5. Abusive Registration

The Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown that the domain name quickquid.uk is an abusive registration

Yes No

6. Other Factors

I am satisfied that no other factors apply which would make a summary decision unconscionable in all the circumstances

Yes No

7. Comments (optional)

The present dispute concerns the domain name quickquid.uk (the 'Domain Name'). Notably, this is not the first dispute between the Parties. In February 2023, the Complainant initiated a DRS complaint against the Respondent in respect of a different domain name, quickquid.co.uk (*DRS 25512*). That case resulted in a summary decision in favour of the Complainant. The appointed expert provided the following reasoning:

"I have decided in favour of the Complainant on the balance of probabilities as the Complaint is undefended and the Complainant has referred to previous customer confusion, suggesting that the Domain Name has been used in a field similar to that of the Complainant. However, the Complaint is weak and the assertions by the Complainant are largely unsupported by evidence. If the Complaint had been contested this lack of evidence could have counted against the Complainant."

As in the earlier case, this is a summary decision, meaning the Expert is not required to provide a detailed explanation of its ruling. That said, the Expert considers it appropriate to outline the principal reasons why the Complaint is unsuccessful.

The Complainant has submitted a copy of the summary decision in *DRS 25512*. It should be noted, however, that the expert in that case described the complaint as “weak” and “largely unsupported by evidence”. The decision nonetheless turned on the Complainant’s unchallenged assertions of confusion, suggesting that the domain name had been used in a field similar to that of the Complainant.

In fairness to the expert in *DRS 25512*, the factual background on which the present decision is based was not available at the time.

The DRS Policy provides that an expert may (in their entire discretion) check any material which is generally available in the public domain. The Expert has exercised that discretion by reviewing earlier decisions on Nominet’s website. Doing so revealed that the Complainant has been involved in previous DRS decisions related to the quickquid.co.uk domain name; namely *DRS 25766* and *DRS 25766 Appeal*.

In *DRS 25766*, which concerned a contractual dispute between the Complainant (then the Respondent) and a company by the name of Quick Credit Limited, the facts revealed that quickquid.co.uk had been previously used by CashEuronet UK LLC (the Respondent in the present case), a company that was highly active in the UK market for short term unsecured loans.

In 2022, CashEuronet UK LLC ran into financial difficulties and entered administration. One of the assets under its control at the time was the quickquid.co.uk domain name.

The case further revealed that the Complainant became interested in acquiring the domain name and came up with two approaches. The first was to submit a DRS complaint relying on alleged evidence of confusion. The second was to contact CashEuronet UK, LLC’s administrators to ascertain if the domain name could be purchased.

In an email exchange produced as evidence in the subsequent *DRS 25766 Appeal*, it was suggested that the Complainant was willing, if necessary, to pay upwards of £20,000 for the domain name.

In *DRS 25766*, the expert criticised the Complainant’s (then the Respondent) misuse of the DRS to obtain the quickquid.co.uk domain name, stating:

“There is scant evidence that in January 2023, [...], the Respondent had a compelling or substantial problem of Domain Name abuse that needed be resolved. Rather, to the Expert, it seems that [sic] the conversation was based on weaponising the DRS to gain control of the Domain Name at little cost.”

The Expert agrees with this observation and is in no doubt that, had these facts been available in *DRS 25512*, the Complainant would not have succeeded.

Although the current Respondent was not a party to either *DRS 25766* or the *DRS 25766 Appeal*, the Expert treats those earlier cases as providing important context when assessing the issue of Abusive Registration in the present case.

As in the *DRS 25512* summary decision, the Expert finds the Complaint to be weak. While the Complainant relies on a trade mark application filed on 26 September 2024,

it accepts that this application is currently being opposed by an unrelated party at the Intellectual Property Office.

The evidence as to how the Complainant has used the term "*QuickQuid*" since the DRS decision in 2023 is limited. Although the Complainant asserts that it has "restored the brand's online presence", no evidence has been provided to demonstrate the existence or extent of any goodwill said to be attached to the name.

Even if the Expert were to find that the Complainant has Rights (as was assumed in the *DRS 25512* summary decision), that would not be determinative of the matter. The Expert finds the Complaint to be incomplete and misleading in light of the facts that emerged in earlier cases involving the Complainant. In particular, the Complainant knew, or must have known, that the registration of the Domain Name could not have taken unfair advantage of its Rights, given the obvious registration chronology, having been registered in 2014, when the Respondent was founded.

Prior to entering administration in 2022, the Respondent was very active in the field of providing short term unsecured finance in the UK. In those circumstances, it would have been impossible for the Respondent to have been motivated by any abusive purpose towards the Complainant, unless it had a supernatural ability to foresee that the Complainant would adopt the name at some point in the future.

The sole argument advanced by the Complainant is that it sees no reason for the Respondent to hold the Domain Name when it has no "genuine commercial or regulated use for the Domain Name". That argument may have carried greater weight in 2023, when the first dispute between the Parties was filed, but in this case the Expert has the benefit of a fuller factual record arising from subsequent DRS proceedings.

The Expert is not persuaded, on the balance of probabilities, that the Domain Name in the hands of the Respondent is an Abusive Registration. Rather, the evidence shows that for many years before the Complainant's existence, the Respondent was legitimately connected to the "*QuickQuid*" name. The Complainant is not entitled to the Domain Name simply because the Respondent entered into administration.

8. Decision

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

Signed:



Dated: 26 January 2026