

Domain DNS And Hosting Records

This guide details how to investigate domain, DNS, and hosting records to uncover website ownership and infrastructure history. It covers unmasking registrants, reconstructing domain activity, and addressing email authentication issues, providing practical guidance for UK litigators.

e-discovery.uk, Computer Forensics Lab. Published 2026-08-30.
<https://e-discovery.uk/library/domain-dns-and-hosting-records>

DOMAIN & HOSTING EVIDENCE · A GUIDE FOR UK LAWYERS Domain, DNS and Hosting Records Who Is Behind a Website, and How Its Infrastructure History Is Proved COMPUTER FORENSICS LAB

§ ABOUT THE AUTHOR PREPARED BY COMPUTER FORENSICS LAB E-DISCOVERY TEAM REGISTRANT UNMASKING CPR PART 35 EXPERT REPORT S FULL CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY DOCUMENTATION

§ CONTENTS In this guide 01 Executive summary 02 The problem in plain English: the address book of the internet 03 The record layers: registration, DNS, hosting and certificates 04 Unmasking: from redacted WHOIS to a named registrant 05 Reconstructing history: what the domain did and when 06 Email authentication: SPF, DKIM, DMARC and spoofing disputes 07 Remedies and process: registrars, hosts, Nominet and the courts 08 Source architecture: where else the evidence lives 09 Worked examples 10 Common mistakes and technical limitations 11 Questions to ask · Suggested wording 12 Checklist and red flags · When to involve a digital forensic expert 13 Frequently asked questions 14 Glossary · References · Disclaimer · How a specialist laboratory can assist

§ 01 · ORIENTATION Executive summary THE HEADLINE POINT: PUBLICINFRASTRUCTURERECORDSNARROWTHEFIELD; REGISTRARANDHOSTDISCLOSURENAMESTHEHAND: ANDTHEHISTORYISARCHIVED EVENWHENTHESITEISGONE

§ 02 · FIRST PRINCIPLES The problem in plain English: the address book of the internet

§ 03 · THELAYERS The record layers: registration, DNS, hosting and certificates

§ 04 · THESEQUENCE Unmasking: from redacted WHOIS to a named registrant

§ 05 · THEPAST Reconstructing history: what the domain did and when

§ 06 · THEMAILQUESTION Email authentication: SPF, DKIM, DMARC and spoofing disputes

§ 07 · GETTINGITSTOPPED, GETTINGITNAMED Remedies and process: registrars, hosts, Nominet and the courts

§ 08 · THEWIDERMAP Source architecture: where else the evidence lives EVIDENCE RECORDS HOST PUBLIC REGISTRAR / (LIVE) ACCOUNTS THIRD-PARTY PAYMENT VICTIM-SIDE DELETED / ARCHIVES LAYER RECORDS RECOVERABLE

§ 09 · IN THE WILD Worked examples EXAMPLE1 · THESUPPLIERELEVEN DAYSOLD

EXAMPLE2 · THE "COMPETITOR" REVIEW SITE EXAMPLE3 ·
THE DOMAIN THAT CHANGED HANDS MID - DISPUTE

§ 10 · WHERE IT GOES WRONG Common mistakes and technical limitations Common mistakes
Technical limitations

§ 11 · INTERROGATORIES & DRAFTING AIDS Questions to ask · Suggested wording Ask
your client Ask your opponent Ask your e Discovery / forensic provider SUGGESTED
WORDING · INFRASTRUCTURE LIMB FOR THE PRESERVATION LETTER

§ 12 · QUICK CONTROL Checklist and red flags · When to involve a digital forensic expert The
infrastructure checklist Red flags When to involve a digital forensic expert

§ 13 · COMMON QUESTIONS Frequently asked questions WHOIS shows the registrant as
"REDACTED FOR PRIVACY". Dead end? The fraudulent site has already been taken down.
Have we lost the evidence? Can we find every domain a wrongdoer operates? An email claims
to be from our client's domain. How do we prove it was not? Is a Norwich Pharmacal order
really available against a registrar or payment process or? Should our client publish DMARC
even if it is the victim here?

§ 14 · REFERENCE Glossary DMARC DKIM RDAP SPF UDRP Sources and authoritative
references DISCLAIMER

§ HOW A SPECIALIST LABORATORY CAN ASSIST Working with Computer Forensics Lab
Speak to a forensic examiner, not a salesperson. INSTRUCT THE LAB
NEW ENQUIRIES EMAIL - DISCOVERY

Questions and answers

WHOIS shows the registrant as "REDACTED FOR PRIVACY". Dead end?

Starting line: the residue (registrar, dates, nameservers) plus fingerprint cluster in g, archives and content identifiers usually narrows sharply, and the registrar holds the actual identity for disclosure by request or order:

The fraudulent site has already been taken down. Have we lost the evidence?

Mostly no: registration and DNS history, certificate logs and content archives were recording all along, the registrar and host retain account records, and the payment layer retains the money's path: §8's map is the recovery plan. What take down does cost is anything never archived: which is why on live matters capture always precedes the abuse report.

Can we find every domain a wrongdoer operates?

Often most of them: certificate transparency, shared fingerprints, nameserver and registration patterns, and same-account disclosure from registrars map estates well: Example 1's o per at or ran to five cousins, Example 2's to two. "Every" is unprovable: findings say "the following linked domains", with the linking evidence per domain, and stay open to additions.

An email claims to be from our client's domain. How do we prove it was not?

From the receipt evidence: the message's Authentication-Results and full headers show whether SPF/DKIM/ DMARC passed at delivery and which infrastructure actually sent it; the client's published records at the date (from DNS history) show what should have passed; and the sending domain's own §3 profile (cousin spelling, creation date, MX) usually completes the story. Where everything passed cleanly from the genuine domain, the inquiry pivots honestly to compromise or insider: guide 79 §6's fork.

Is a Norwich Pharmacal order really available against a registrar or payment process or?

In principle yes, on the standard mixed-up-in-wrongdoing basis, and process or s are often the most productive target because payment instruments resist fabrication: the practical constraints are jurisdiction and drafting precision (exact domains, accounts, dates, in the respondent's own vocabulary). The §4 package is what persuades the court the order will actually identify someone.

Should our client publish DMARC even if it is the victim here?

Immediately: a reject-policy DMARC record (rolled out carefully) makes the client's domain hard to spoof and generates reports of attempts: prospectively protective, and retrospectively relevant, since the absent policy at the material time is increasingly raised in loss-allocation arguments after payment frauds, as Example 1's bank correspondence shows. It is the rare remediation that is also good evidence hygiene. cflab. u k · e-discove r y. u k ©2026 Computer Forensics Lab Ltd ·cflab.uk ·e-discovery.uk ·info@cflab.uk ·+44 (0)20 7164 6915 Page 15 of 17