Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107897

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-107897**
Time of filing	**2025-09-01 09:32:03**
Domain names	**qlikmove.com**

Case administrator

Name	**Olga Slanařová (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**QlikTech International AB**

Complainant representative

Organization	**Abion AB**

Respondent

Name	**zhen zhao**

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 is the owner of several trademarks consisting of the word element “Qlik” such as:

- International trademark, designating China for “QLIK” No.839118 of May 14, 2004;
- International trademark for “QLIK” No. 1781507 of December 20, 2023;
- EU trademark for “QLIK” No. 001115948 of May 16, 2000.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant is a global leader in artificial intelligence, data analytics and business intelligence solutions, offering software to businesses worldwide. As of 2025, the QlikTech Group serves more than 40,000 global customers and has more than 235,000 community members. The QlikTech Group also maintains a robust network of international partners, including Amazon, Google and Microsoft.

The Complainant provides various services and functions under the “QLIK” trademark, such as Qlik Data Movement, which helps customers move data and analytics.

The disputed domain name <qlikmoves.com> has been created by the Respondent on May 13, 2025. The website is being passively held.

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

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

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the Panel may draw such conclusions therefrom as it considers appropriate. The Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent.

Taking the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant under careful consideration, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established all the elements entitling it to claim the transfer of the disputed domain name.

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar disputed domain name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”).

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that it has valid trademark rights in “Qlik”.

The disputed domain name includes the Complainant's trademarks in its entirety. The word “Qlik” has no inherent meaning and is therefore associated exclusively with the Complainant.

The addition of the descriptive term “move” is not sufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the trademarks. Where a domain name incorporates a trademark in its entirety, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark (WIPO Case No. D2020-2410 – Bentley Motors Limited v. Domain Admin / Kyle Rocheleau, Privacy Hero Inc. among others). In the present case, additionally to incorporating the entire trademark, the term “move” is at least vaguely associated with the Complainant’s trademark in the public perception. This is because the Complainant's services include moving its client’s data and analytics. Under their trademark this is described by unprotected title “Qlik Data Movement”.

Lastly, the addition of the gTLD suffix “.COM” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the trademarks of the Complainant.

II. The Respondent’s Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, demonstrated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings lies with the Complainant, the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent where the Complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. If the Respondent fails to provide evidence for its rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (WIPO Case No. D2004-0110 – Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o.; WIPO case no. D2003-0455 – Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

The Complainant has established a prima facie proof that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to use its trademarks in a domain name. Further, the disputed domain name does not correspond to the name of the Respondent, nor is the Respondent commonly known as “Qlik” or "Qlikmove", nor has the usage of the disputed domain name any connection to the Complainant that would serve as a legitimate interest without needing a licence, e.g. for a critical examination of the Complainant's activities.

Summarised, Complainant has established the necessary prima facie proof and there is no evidence for a use of the disputed domain name for any bona fide offer of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use. Therefore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in Bad Faith

The Respondent has also registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy by intentionally attempting to attract internet users to their website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii).

The Complainant’s business was founded in 1993 and had grown into an established and internationally well-known brand for data integration, AI and analytics. Despite the Complainant's services not being aimed at consumers, but rather at businesses, they have nevertheless reached the threshold in the B2B marketof serving 40,000 global customers. Further, it has more than 235,000 community members in its niche.

The word “Qlik” has no inherent meaning and is therefore associated exclusively with the Complainant. The whole domain “qlikmove” does not include words with inherent meaning apart from “move”. Therefore, when separating this word from the rest of the domain name, the domain is perceived as “qlik move”. It is not apparent, why the Respondent would use the part “qlik” in the domain name, other than to create the impression of being, or being associated with the Complainant (compare WIPO Case No. D2000-0003 – Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows). Given the Complainant's standing shown above, this is evident to the Panel.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii).

The Respondent's mere passive holding of the disputed domain name by itself may not allow sufficient conclusions to be drawn as to whether the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in good or bad faith (see para. 7.8 WIPO Case No. D2000-0003 – Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows). However, despite the passivity of the Respondent, the circumstances of the individual case must be assessed and can lead to the conclusion of bad faith (see para. 7.9 WIPO Case No. D2000-0003 – Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows).

In the present case, “Qlik” has no inherent meaning, which suggests that the domain is being used to be associated with the Complainant's trademark. This is underlined by the fact, that the subsequent “move” is also a word that can be associated with the activity of the Complainant of moving its client's data. The Respondent has had several opportunities over the course of three months to provide the Complainant or the Panel with evidence of its good faith. Specifically, the Respondent was contacted by the Complainant on June 23, July 3 and July 8, 2025, but did not respond. On September 2, 2025, the Respondent was notified of the Complaint, but the email was returned. This supports the assumption, that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for illegitimate purposes.

Considering all these circumstances it is not possible to think of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate (using this criterion: para. 7.12 (v.) WIPO Case No. D2000-0003 – Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows).

Therefore, the Panel is convinced, that the disputed domain name is being used to make users confuse the website with the Complainant's actual website. This constitutes a case of bad faith under para. 4 (a)(iii) without falling under one of the explicit categories of para. 4 (b) (“without limitation”).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **qlikmove.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dominik Eickemeier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-01

Publish the Decision