

# Dominic Bright



Dominic practises international, commercial and property law.

In June 2022, he completed a three-month secondment to the world's largest publicly-traded property and casualty insurer, where he specialised in autonomous sanctions surrounding marine and aviation insurance.

He was [judicial assistant](#) to Sir Brian Leveson (then [President of the Queen's Bench Division](#)).



**Year of Call: 2016**

Contact Practice Manager  
Joe Grimmer  
[joe@lambchambers.co.uk](mailto:joe@lambchambers.co.uk)  
020 7797 8307

VAT Reg No  
308639389

## Publications

Dominic assists authors to publish academic articles and professional texts on national and international law. He also publishes in his own right.

### Books

- ['A Practical Guide to the Small Claims Track \(Second Edition\)'](#) (Law Brief Publishing, December 2020)
- ['Trespass to Land'](#) in volume 40(1) of [Atkin's Court Forms](#) (Practice and Forms) (assisted the contributor, [Simon Brilliant](#), LexisNexis, August 2019)

### Articles

- ['Academia, The Judiciary & Practical Legal Scholarship'](#) (Association of District Judges Bulletin, January 2022)
- ['Staying on Track: Ten Key Points that PI Lawyers Should Know About the Small Claims Track'](#) (PI Focus, March 2020)
- ['The CICC and the Rule of Law: Fair, Transparent and Convenient? What You Need to Know About China's New International Commercial Court'](#) (Counsel Magazine, September 2019)
- ['Section 21 Sent Packing'](#) (New Law Journal, Issue 7838, 2 May 2019)
- ['Treaty-Making Within the British Commonwealth'](#) (assisted the author, [Sir Franklin Berman KCMG QC](#), [2015] Melbourne Law Review 4)



## Seminars / training

Dominic accepts invitations to present seminars / training from professional clients. He also attends other professional events.

### Recent invitations

- 'Small Claims Training' – Seminar One, 8 September 2020 (admissions; interim payments; and remote final hearings); Seminar Two, 30 September 2020 (when, how and benefits of making an oral application for strike out and / or summary judgment; judicial intervention v entering the arena; and departure from fixed costs following a finding that a party has behaved unreasonably); and Seminar Three, 23 October 2020 (appearing against litigants in person)
- Training for a niche commercial and residential property law firm on forfeiture, trespass and assured shorthold tenancies (July 2020)
- 'Future of International Dispute Resolution' (discussant analysing the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on international commercial contracts with the International Dispute Resolution Group, June 2020)
- 'Jurisdiction and Choice of Law Clauses in International Commercial Contracts' (seminar to City lawyers, November 2019)
- Defence barrister in a mock trial following a road traffic collision and claim for credit hire (training for a leading law firm of about 2,500 employees and an insurer with over 166,000 employees, July 2019)

### Recent events

- 'International Law in Future Frontiers' (Chatham House, May 2022)
- 'Mediation and Negotiation Masterclass' (Property Bar Association, April 2022)
- 'Revisiting: We, the Robots' (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, March 2022)
- 'PBA Annual Dinner 2021' (Globe Theatre, London, December 2021)
- 'PBA Conference 2021 – Property Litigation in a World of Change' (November 2021)
- 'Civil Mediation Council Annual Conference 2021' (Remote, November 2021)
- 'Junior PBA Webinar – Dilapidations and Disrepair' (Remote, July 2021)
- 'Civil Mediation Council Annual Conference 2020' (Remote, November 2020)
- 'Short Course: Public International Law in Practice' (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, September 2020)



- [‘Short Course: Law of the Sea’](#) (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, September 2020)
- [‘Collaborative Resolution of Disputes and COVID-19’](#) (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, June 2020)
- [‘Meeting in a Post-pandemic World’](#) (Civil Mediation Council, June 2020)
- [‘Virtual Justice in France, UK and US: Status and Challenges of Remote Hearings and Trials’](#) (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, June 2020)
- [‘Artificial Intelligence: The Future of Regulation – A Conversation with Lord Clement-Jones’](#) (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, June 2020)
- [‘Force Majeure and Hardship in Commercial Contracts: Cross-border and Comparative Perspectives’](#) (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, April 2020)
- [‘COVID-19 and International Law: What Went Wrong and What Can We Learn From It?’](#) (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, April 2020)
- [‘National Security and the Law in the 2020s’](#) (Middle Temple, February 2020)
- [‘Climate Change Litigation: Comparative and International Perspectives’](#) (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, January 2020)
- [‘Civil Mediation Council Annual Conference 2019’](#) (Hallam Conference Centre, November 2019)
- [‘Property Bar Association Conference 2018: Fraud and Equity in Practice’](#) (The Honourable Society of Gray’s Inn, 27 November 2018)

## Further information

Dominic holds two postgraduate qualifications, is an active member of various domestic and international professional associations, and enjoys gardening, travelling and learning about geopolitics when time permits.

## Qualifications

- Master of Laws (LL.M) in Professional Legal Practice (incorporating the BPTC), BPP University Law School, London Holborn, awarded Distinction
- Master of Laws (LL.M), King’s College London, School of Law, awarded Distinction
- Law (LLB Hons) with European Legal Studies, King’s College London, School of Law (incorporating an Erasmus exchange at Uppsala University, Sweden)

## Memberships

- [British Institute of International and Comparative Law](#)



- Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs
- Civil Mediation Council
- Commercial Bar Association
- Property Bar Association
- Technology and Construction Bar Association

## Interests

- Training “Merlin” the German Shepherd, playing the VAD 706 V-Drums [Acoustic Design](#), and horse-riding
- Conserving a Sixteenth-Century, Grade II listed property of special architectural and historic interest, as a member of [The Listed Property Owners’ Club](#)
- National, regional and global threats, challenges and opportunities including the changing nature of geopolitics in relation to sustainable growth, prevention of conflict, and development of the rule of law

## Commercial

Dominic’s commercial practice includes all contractual claims.

He accepts devilling instructions from Silks and senior juniors on larger and more complex cases, including offshore arbitrations. Dominic also regularly defends a well-known, multinational bank in claims made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure.

He has a particular interest in advising on commercial use of novel technologies, including small, unmanned aircraft, on which he wrote a leading article: **[‘Drones, Airprox, and the Regulatory Environment: Cause for Concern?’](#)**

Dominic is a member of the [Commercial Bar Association](#).

## Recent instructions

- *M v J* – successfully cross-examined the director of the defendant company, and made submissions, so that the claim for professional fees was allowed with £4,000 interest. Email from professional client, dated 12 April 2022: *‘As an FYI, [the witness for the claimant company] was really complimentary about your skeleton argument. He referred to the skeleton as “excellent”.’*
- *Office of the Traffic Commissioner v R* – successfully represented the company and director of the company, so that the indication was given that the Traffic Commissioner was unlikely to call either to public inquiry (March 2022).
- *M v J* – successfully resisted applications to adjourn for further directions, strike out and / or summary judgment (March 2022).



- *Office of the Traffic Commissioner v L* – successfully made submissions, so that there was no further regulatory action (except undertakings) after a public inquiry to consider the good repute of the licence holder and director to hold the licence (February 2022).
- *H v B* – represented a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure (January 2022).
- *F v Y & Anor* – successfully made submissions so that the application to set aside was dismissed, the defendants paid the claimant's costs of £2,000, and a final charging order was made including the further costs and interest thereof. Email from professional client, dated 13 December 2021: *'Received your voicemail – thank you and that's a great outcome – reflected in the excellent costs order.'*
- *Office of the Traffic Commissioner v T* – successfully submitted that there should be no further regulatory action after a public inquiry to consider the good repute of the licence holder and transport managers to hold the licence. Email from professional client, dated 15 December 2021: *'Great result'*.
- *Office of the Traffic Commissioner v S* – successfully submitted that there should be no further regulatory action after a public inquiry to consider the fitness of the company and its director to hold the licence. Email from professional client, dated 9 December 2021: *'It is a pleasure working with you and the Lamb Chambers team'*.
- *M v J* – preparation for a final hearing (which was adjourned) claiming over £10,000 in respect of outstanding professional fees, about £4,000 interest, and over £4,500 costs. Email from professional client, dated 7 December 2021: *'Thank you so much for today. When we receive the new trial date, will it be possible for you to attend (subject to your availability).'*
- *T v B* – represented a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure (September 2021).
- *L v V* – skeleton argument on behalf of a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure. Email from professional client, dated 1 September 2021: *'Thanks Dominic – that's great – we're very grateful for your assistance and work'*.
- Drafted Tomlin order on behalf of a property developer, who sold a property well in excess of £1 million, before the purchaser issued a claim for breach of contract, including allegations that construction work caused the death of 12 beech and sycamore trees (August 2021).
- *C v B* – successfully represented a bank in a claim for



'up to £25,000' made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure, so that it was dismissed. After cross-examination, the judge found that: *"This statement is hopeless. The witness evidence is lamentable. ... I cannot place any reliance on it."* Email from professional client, dated 25 August 2021: *'I am grateful to you for all your hard work in achieving this great result! I will be writing to the client to pass on the good news.'*

- Devilling for a Silk on procedure and prospects of successfully appealing an arbitration in a Caribbean country where the costs on each side were in the region of \$10 US million. Email from Silk, dated 20 July 2021: *'Huge thanks as always – and for staying up so late to complete your note. I wish I had your stamina!'*
- *P v B* – represented a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure (July 2021).
- *M v B* – represented a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure. Email from professional client, dated 14 July 2021: *'Thank you for attending the hearing and for providing this detailed attendance note, which is very helpful!'*
- *B v B* – represented a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure. Email from professional client, dated 2 July 2021: *'Pleasure to speak with you earlier and thanks again.'*
- *B v B* – represented a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure (June 2021).
- *P v B* – represented a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure. Email from professional client, dated 28 June 2021: *'Many thanks for your assistance on this matter ... I shall pass your feedback onto the team at [professional client's firm] and look forward to working with you again in the future.'*
- *H v B* – represented a bank in a claim made under the Consumer Credit Act procedure (June 2021).
- *B v C* – successfully submitted that default judgment should be set aside, and that there should be no order as to costs. Email from professional client, dated 8 June 2021: *'Thanks Dominic!'*
- *S v G & Anor* – successfully resisted an appeal (against summary judgment in respect of the first appellant, default judgment in respect of the second appellant, and judgment against both appellants for more than £105,000, about £7,000 interest, and costs of £17,000) with costs awarded on the indemnity basis (May 2021).
- *P v R* – successfully applied for summary judgment for about £15,500, about £2,000 interest, and £3,500 costs. Email from professional client, dated 11 March 2021: *'I just wanted to say thank you for all your hard work yesterday.'*



- Devilling (opinion) in a potential claim of more than one-third of a million pounds, where the issues included illegality, force majeure and frustration during the COVID-19 pandemic (December 2020).
- Devilling for a Silk (draft list of issues, draft opening and draft closing submissions) in an international commercial arbitration under the CIArb Arbitration Rules (Bermuda) 2019, claiming damages of over US \$17 million for breach of contract. Emails from Silk, dated 10 November, 22, 21 and 19 September 2020: *'You're a star ... Very helpful ... You never cease to impress me! ... Great stuff. You have the magic touch. Huge thanks, as always ... Big thanks for all your help. Hugely needed. Dominic is a veritable forensic star. ... You will see the extent to which I adopted your very fine work.'*
- *R & Anor v E* – claim form and particulars of claim following a wedding that did not take place due to restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic, claiming repayment of sums paid pursuant to contract because consideration had wholly failed, alternatively damages, further or alternatively the sums paid pursuant to the contract before the contract was discharged because performance was frustrated, further or alternatively payment of the sums paid under the contract as money had and received. Email from professional client, dated 10 September 2020: *'Many thanks for this. It reads very well.'*
- *P & Anor v P* – claim form and particulars of claim following a wedding that did not take place due to the COVID-19 lockdown, claiming repayment of sums paid pursuant to the contract because consideration had wholly failed, alternatively damages, further or alternatively the sums paid pursuant to the contract before the contract was discharged because performance became illegal, further or alternatively payment of the sums paid under the contract as money had and received (August 2020).
- Advice in conference following a wedding that did not take place due to the COVID-19 lockdown following the Health Protection (Coronavirus Restrictions) (England) Regulations 2020/350, where the issues included force majeure, frustration, supervening illegality and consumer protection under the Consumer Rights Act 2015, the Consumer Contracts (Information, Cancellation and Additional Charges) Regulations 2013, and the Unfair Trading Regulations 2008. Email from professional client, dated 15 July 2020: *'Thank you ever so much. It was super helpful and I look forward to working with you again in the near future.'*
- *Office of the Traffic Commissioner v G* – successfully



represented a sole trader at one of the first in-person public inquiries after the COVID-19 lockdown, so that, although an operator licence was revoked and a disqualification as transport manager was ordered, there was no disqualification as an operator:

*“Normally I would make an equally lengthy disqualification order against an operator with [G’s] record. But I acknowledge that he has made genuine and strenuous efforts to improve compliance since October 2019 (even if there remains some way to go). Exceptionally, I have decided not to make a disqualification order in his case.”*

- *S v G & Anor* – successfully applied for judgment against both defendants for a six-figure sum (with interest at three percent); applied for costs in the sum of £17,000; resisted the defendants’ application for an adjournment; resisted the first defendant’s application to file and serve an amended defence; resisted the second defendant’s application for relief from sanctions and permission to extend the time to file and serve a defence and counterclaim; applied for summary judgment against the first defendant on the basis that there was no real prospect of successfully defending the claim and no other compelling reason why the case should be disposed of at trial; and requested that default judgment to be entered against the second defendant on the ground that a defence had not been filed and the relevant time limit for doing so had expired. Message from lay client, received by professional client, dated 11 June 2020: *‘I am 100% fully satisfied.’*
- *K v M* – devilling for a Silk, namely researching and drafting the skeleton argument and bundle of authorities in applications before the High Court for general civil restraint orders, and non-party costs orders to be awarded on the indemnity basis (April 2020).
- Advice, letters before claim, and particulars of claim for breach of contract or alternatively money had and received in the sum of £100,000 plus interest (February 2020).
- *U v E* – successfully made an oral application on the day of trial for summary judgment in the sum of about £10,000 (January 2020).
- *Office of the Traffic Commissioner v P* – successfully represented a company in a public inquiry, considering whether the operator was of good repute and had appropriate financial standing; successfully invited the commissioner to hear from the director of that company, who was not able to verify his identity in accordance with the letter calling that company to public inquiry; successfully made an oral application for a period of grace before



- a standard national goods vehicle licence for five vehicles and seven trailers was revoked, despite failure to produce original or certified copies of evidence demonstrating financial standing; and successfully avoided regulatory action despite the commissioner finding “a problem with the maintenance documents” (November 2019).
- *H v O-B* – successfully applied for relief from sanctions, and that the claim be reinstated, despite findings of a serious and significant breach of a court order, for which there was no good reason, and that the application was not made promptly (November 2019).
  - *S v F & Anor* – successfully made an oral application for judgment against both defendants for around £40,000, and costs of about £11,000 in a directions hearing (September 2019).
  - *Office of the Traffic Commissioner v D & Anor* – successfully represented two companies in a public inquiry considering the fitness of those companies and their directors to hold an operator licence, and then successfully applied for a restricted goods operator’s licence to authorise the use of three vehicles. Email from professional client, dated 5 September 2019: *‘Thank you for your attendance note which I found very comprehensive ... I will have another case for you shortly and will advise accordingly.’*
  - Advice on prospects of defending a claim in the region of £40,000, and counterclaiming in the region of £70,000, upon alleged breach of vacant possession by the seller of a six-bedroom property (June 2019).
  - *A v S & Two Ors* – devilling for a Silk, drafting a skeleton argument for use in proceedings in the Chancery Division of the High Court (March 2019).
  - *I v A* – successfully made an oral application and was granted relief from sanctions on day one of a multi-track trial in relation to service of the defence, hearsay notice, and witness statement, which were served the day before trial; successfully made submissions so that only about one-twelfth of the five-figure amount claimed was in fact awarded (plus VAT); and successfully submitted that the winning party’s costs should be substantially reduced, so that they were capped to half (March 2019).
  - Advised on alleged breaches of data protection legislation by a high street bank, and damages that could be expected from a court award (August 2018).
  - Advised film production company on whether an Independent Film & Television Alliance arbitration clause was valid in a claim for around £25,000 (May 2018).



