Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107622

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107622
Time of filing	2025-05-29 10:21:13
Domain names	qlikcloudanalytics.com, qlikautomate.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	QlikTech International AB

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion AB

Respondent

Name	mesut erdogan

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain names <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com>.

.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, QlikTech International AB, has submitted evidence of its ownership of registered trademark rights in the QLIK® and QLIK CLOUD® marks in multiple jurisdictions worldwide. These registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain names <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com>, which were registered on April 23 and April 28, 2025, respectively.

Notable trademark registrations include:

- International Reg. No. 839118 for QLIK® (designating Turkey), registered May 14, 2004;
- EU Reg. No. 001115948 for QLIK®, registered May 16, 2000;
- U.S. Reg. No. 2657563 for QLIK®, registered December 10, 2002; and
- EU Reg. No. 014437982 for QLIK CLOUD®, registered November 19, 2015.

The Complainant has also filed pending trademark applications for QLIK CLOUD ANALYTICS® and QLIK AUTOMATE®, which were submitted on the same days that the corresponding disputed domain names were registered.

The QLIK® mark has been acknowledged as well-known in prior UDRP decisions (see QlikTech International AB v. BENZAKOUR ABDELALI, WIPO Case No. D2024-5123). The Complainant operates its official website at <qlik.com> (registered March 17, 1998) and maintains a portfolio of domain names incorporating its trademarks. These domains are used to promote the Complainant's services and maintain its online presence, including through active social media platforms.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, QlikTech International AB, is part of the QlikTech Group, a global provider of artificial intelligence, data analytics, and business intelligence solutions. Founded in Sweden in 1993, the Complainant offers software and services under the QLIK® mark, including solutions marketed as Qlik Automate and Qlik Cloud Analytics.

As of 2025, the QlikTech Group serves over 40,000 customers worldwide and maintains a user community of more than 235,000 members. It operates through a wide network of international partners, including Amazon, Google, and Microsoft. The Group maintains a global presence with offices and associated entities in North America, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. It is active in both the United States and Turkey through local affiliates and partners.

The disputed domain names, <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com>, were registered on April 23, 2025, and April 28, 2025, respectively.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

1. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the protected mark

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com> are confusingly similar to its registered QLIK® and QLIK CLOUD® trademarks. It argues that both disputed domain names incorporate the QLIK® mark in its entirety, with the only differences being the addition of descriptive terms directly related to the Complainant's own services — "cloud analytics" and "automate" — along with the ".com" top-level domain.

The Complainant emphasizes that these additional terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, particularly as "Qlik Cloud Analytics" and "Qlik Automate" are names of actual services it provides. It also notes that it has filed EU trademark applications for QLIK CLOUD ANALYTICS® and QLIK AUTOMATE® on the same dates as the registrations of the corresponding disputed domain names.

Citing WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 1.8, the Complainant submits that the recognizable presence of its QLIK® mark within the disputed domain names is sufficient to establish confusing similarity. Furthermore, the inclusion of the generic top-level domain ".com" does not negate the similarity, as it is considered a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in the analysis under the first element.

Accordingly, the Complainant maintains that it has satisfied the first element of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com>.

First, the Complainant confirms that it has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the QLIK® trademark in any form, including within the disputed domain names.

Second, the Complainant submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names. Online searches for the terms "qlik cloud analytics", "qlikcloudanalytics", "qlik automate", and "qlikautomate" yield results that relate exclusively to the Complainant, its website, and its services.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent could have easily conducted such searches before registering the disputed domain names and would have discovered the Complainant's longstanding trademark rights and business operations.

Further, searches for registered trademarks containing the disputed domain names terms reveal only the Complainant's pending trademark applications for QLIK CLOUD ANALYTICS® and QLIK AUTOMATE®. No trademarks are registered in the name of the Respondent. Notably, both disputed domain names were registered on the exact dates that the Complainant filed these applications, suggesting prior knowledge and intent to capitalize on the Complainant's rights.

The Complainant discovered that the disputed domain names resolved to GoDaddy parking pages listing the disputed domain names for sale at a fixed price of USD 2,988, both at the time of discovery and at the time of the Complaint and Amended Complaint filings. The Complainant argues this demonstrates that the disputed domain names were registered with the intent to sell, not for any legitimate use

Under WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, paragraph 2.5.2, the Complainant emphasizes that there is no evidence of use or preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for any legitimate noncommercial purpose. The structure of the disputed domain names, which combine the well-known QLIK® trademark with terms directly associated with the Complainant's services, supports an inference of intent to create confusion among Internet users.

Additionally, WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, section 2.5.1, affirms that even domain names containing a trademark plus additional terms cannot constitute fair use if they imply affiliation or endorsement by the trademark owner.

Finally, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on May 7, 2025, via available contact forms and the registrar, followed by a reminder on May 19, 2025. The Respondent did not respond.

Accordingly, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) and paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

3. The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com> in bad faith, in violation of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Registration in Bad Faith
The Complainant's QLIK® trademark is well known and predates the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names by many years. The Respondent has never been authorized to use the Complainant's trademark, which is also registered in Turkey—where the Respondent is based.

The Complainant argues that it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of its rights, especially given the Complainant's online presence and the fact that prior UDRP panels have recognized QLIK® as a well-known trademark. The timing of the disputed domain names registrations—on the exact same days that the Complainant filed EU trademark applications for QLIK CLOUD ANALYTICS® and QLIK AUTOMATE®—further supports the assertion that the Respondent acted with knowledge of the Complainant and its marks.

The Complainant also points out that the Respondent is the subject of multiple prior UDRP decisions, establishing a pattern of abusive conduct.

Use in Bad Faith

The disputed domain names currently resolve to GoDaddy parking pages where they are offered for sale at a price of USD 2,988, indicating intent to profit from the Complainant's trademark. This, the Complainant argues, constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Further, the composition of the disputed domain names—each incorporating the QLIK® mark and additional terms directly referring to the Complainant's services—creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's brand. This is consistent with bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant highlights that the Respondent failed to reply to a cease-and-desist letter or to offer any credible rationale for registering the disputed domain names. The use of a privacy shield to conceal the Respondent's identity further supports an inference of bad faith.

In conclusion, the Complainant submits that the Respondent's actions demonstrate a clear intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain, and therefore satisfy the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names should be transferred to it.

RESPONDENT:

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of

the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The UNIFORM DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) (the "Policy") provides that a complainant must prove each of the following to obtain transfer or cancellation of a domain name:

1. that respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights; and

2. that respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

3. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1) The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights (Para.4(a)(i) of the Policy).

The Complainant has submitted evidence of its ownership of numerous trademark registrations for the mark QLIK® in jurisdictions around the world, including in Turkey, where the Respondent is located. The Panel accepts that the Complainant has established rights in the QLIK® trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

Each of the disputed domain names—<qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com>—incorporates the Complainant's QLIK® mark in its entirety. The additional terms "cloud analytics" and "automate" are descriptive of the Complainant's actual services, which are provided under the QLIK® brand. These terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. In fact, their use may even increase the likelihood of confusion by suggesting that the disputed domain names refer to specific offerings of the Complainant, especially as the Complainant has filed trademark applications for QLIK CLOUD ANALYTICS® and QLIK AUTOMATE® on the same days the respective disputed domain names were registered.

According to section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, "where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element." The QLIK® trademark remains clearly recognizable and is the dominant element in both disputed domain names.

The addition of the generic top-level domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded when assessing confusing similarity under the Policy.

In conclusion, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com> are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2) The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names (Para. 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Once such a prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1).

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the QLIK® trademark, nor to register the disputed domain names incorporating it. There is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names <qlikcloudanalytics.com> or <qlikautomate.com>, nor that the Respondent is making a bona fide offering of goods or services or using the disputed domain names for a legitimate non-commercial purpose.

To the contrary, the evidence shows that both disputed domain names were registered on the same days the Complainant filed trademark applications for QLIK CLOUD ANALYTICS® and QLIK AUTOMATE®, and that the disputed domain names were

immediately listed for sale at a fixed price. This timing, together with the Respondent's history of prior UDRP proceedings and use of a privacy service to conceal its identity, undermines any claim to a legitimate interest.

Moreover, the Respondent has not filed a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or provide any credible explanation or evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the second element of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3) The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the Complainant's QLIK® trademark is distinctive and has acquired significant recognition in the field of business intelligence, data analytics, and automation solutions. The disputed domain names <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com> incorporate the QLIK® mark in its entirety, combined with the descriptive terms "cloud analytics" and "automate," which directly relate to the Complainant's offerings and pending trademark applications.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names on the exact same days that the Complainant filed its EU trademark applications for QLIK CLOUD ANALYTICS® and QLIK AUTOMATE®, respectively. In the Panel's view, this precise timing is unlikely to be coincidental and instead supports a strong inference that the Respondent had prior knowledge of the Complainant's marks or impending filings. Such conduct evidences deliberate targeting of the Complainant and its intellectual property.

At the time the Complaint was filed, both disputed domain names resolved to GoDaddy.com parking pages listing them for sale at USD 2,988 each. This indicates that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain names primarily for the purpose of selling them at a profit. The Panel considers such conduct to fall within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, which identifies bad faith where a domain name is registered primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring it to the complainant or a competitor for valuable consideration in excess of out-of-pocket costs.

The Respondent has also used a privacy protection service to obscure its identity. While privacy shields may serve legitimate purposes in some cases, their use in this context—alongside the opportunistic timing, commercial offering, and lack of any plausible legitimate use—reinforces the impression of evasiveness and bad faith intent.

Moreover, the Respondent has been the subject of multiple prior UDRP proceedings, several of which have resulted in findings of bad faith. This history demonstrates a pattern of abusive domain name registration, consistent with paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. As emphasized in WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3, evidence of such a pattern is highly relevant in assessing bad faith.

In the absence of any Response or contrary evidence, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names with the intention of exploiting the Complainant's trademark rights for commercial gain.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **qlikcloudanalytics.com**: Transferred
2. **qlikautomate.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Barbora Donathová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-06-26

Publish the Decision