Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107684

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107684
Time of filing	2025-06-25 09:59:07
Domain names	qlik.store

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	QlikTech International AB

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion AB

Respondent

Organization	Domain Name Privacy Inc.

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 name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it is the owner of multiple registrations for trademarks that consist of or contain QLIK (the "QLIK Trademark"), including the following QLIK Trademark registration in force, EU Reg. No. 001115948 (registered May 16, 2000), Int'l. Reg. No. 839118 (registered May 14, 2004), EU Reg. No. 011611126 for QLIK (registered July 2, 2013) and EU Reg. No. 011611126 (registered July 2, 2013) and US Reg. No. 3114427 (registered July 11, 2006).

Moreover, the Complainant is also the owner of the domain names bearing the sign "QLIK" such as the domain names <qlik.com> (registered on March 17, 1998), <qlik.net> (created on November 25, 2002) or also <qlikview.com> (registered on April 10, 2000).

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on November 5, 2024, and resolved to a website with pay-per-click links in the field of data management, business intelligence tools.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant:

The Complainant, QlikTech International AB, is a Swedish company established in 1993 and forms part of the QlikTech Group, a globally recognized leader in artificial intelligence, data analytics, and business intelligence solutions. Through its innovative

software platform, the QlikTech Group enables organizations across various industries to transform raw data into meaningful insights, driving smarter decision-making.

As of 2025, the QlikTech Group serves over 40,000 customers worldwide and maintains a robust international presence through regional offices, affiliates, and an extensive network of strategic partners including industry giants such as Amazon, Google, and Microsoft. The Group operates across North America, Europe, Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, Africa.

The Complainant owns an extensive portfolio of globally registered trademarks, including QLIK®, QLIK DATA CATALYST®, QLIK DATATRANSFER®, and QLIK LEAD WITH DATA®, all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name. These trademarks are recognized internationally, with registrations in the United States, European Union, among others.

The disputed domain name:

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on November 5, 2024, and resolved to a website with pay-per-click links in the field of data management, business intelligence tools. This misleading content falsely suggested an affiliation with the Complainant or with the aim to divert traffic.

Upon discovery, the Complainant issued a cease-and-desist letter and follow-up notices to the Respondent, none of which were answered.

Remedies Sought:

The Complainant seeks the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domains name should be transferred to it. The Complainant makes a number of legal arguments and also supplies a set of annexes providing evidence of its activities and of the Respondent's pay-per-click use of a website sets on the disputed domain name.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed by the Respondent.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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 name (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 name has been registered and is 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

Notwithstanding the fact that no Response has been filed, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or confusingly similar

The trademark citation and documentation provided by Complainant are sufficient to establish that Complainant has rights in the QLIK Trademark.

As to whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to these trademarks, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the disputed domain name only i.e. "QLIK" because "[t]he applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name (e.g. '.store') is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test." WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.11.1.

Here, the disputed domain name contains the QLIK Trademark in its entirety, with no alteration or addition. It is thus a strictly identical reproduction of the prior trademarks.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has proven the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests: Paragraph 4(a)(ii)

Complainant states that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because, inter alia, "Complainant has never granted the Respondent with any rights to use the [QLIK Trademark] in any form, including in the disputed domain name"; "Complainant has not found that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name"; "[t]here is no evidence showing that the Respondent has been using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or has made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name"; "the structure of the disputed domain name… reflect the Respondent's intention to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, in Internet users' mind"; and Respondent has not replied to Complainant's cease-and-desist letter.

WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1, states: "While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible task of 'proving a negative', requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element."

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its prima facie case and, without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith: Paragraph 4(a)(iii)

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the Policy may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or the registrant has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the registrant's website or location or of a product or service on the registrant's website or location.

As set forth in section 3.1.4 of WIPO Overview 3.0: "Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar… to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith." That is applicable here.

Further, by offering to sell the disputed domain name and to have set a pay-per-click page with ling to services identical or similar to that of the Complainant, it appears that Respondent has "acquired the domain name[s] primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration[s] to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name." Policy, para. 4(b)(i).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has proven the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **qlik.store**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**David-Irving Tayer**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-07-27

Publish the Decision