Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107896

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107896
Time of filing	2025-09-01 09:36:17
Domain names	qlikit.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	QlikTech International AB

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion AB

Respondent

Name	HYUNWOO YOO

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

According to the evidence before the Panel, the Complainant is the registered owner of several trademark registrations for the word mark "QLIK", in particular the following marks:

- European Union trademark registration no. 001115948, registered on May 16, 2000 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 42;
- International trademark registration no. 839118 registered on May 14, 2004 for goods and services 9, 35, 42 and designating amongst others the Republic of Korea, where the Respondent is located.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant provides solutions that span information technology (IT) and operational technology (OT).

It results from the registrar verification response that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 23, 2025. The language of the Registration Agreement is English.

According to the Complainant's documented allegations, which remained undisputed, the disputed domain name resolves to a GoDaddy.com parking page listing the disputed domain name for sale with a buy-now price of USD 2.999.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <qlikit.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

It incorporates the entirety of said trademark "Qlik" identically - and placing it at the beginning of the disputed domain name - combining it with the letters "it", which could be understood as descriptive indication to the Complainant's field of activity in the information technology ("IT") business. Therefore, the Panel considers the addition of the letters "IT" as not being sufficient to render the disputed domain name dissimilar to Complainant’s registered trademark which quantitatively dominates the disputed domain name and which, in the Panel's view, remains recognizable within the disputed domain name.

2.

In the absence of any Response, or any other information from the Respondent indicating the contrary, the Panel further holds that the Complainant successfully presented a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In particular, it results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations and evidence that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, and he is not related in any way to the Complainant’s business. Moreover, the Respondent has not demonstrated any preparations to use the disputed domain name - which is currently inactive - in connection with a bona fide offering goods or services. Finally, the Panel has not been presented any evidence that could lead the Panel to the conclusion that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that he has acquired trademark rights. In particular, the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database under the disputed domain name.

3.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

It remained undisputed that the Respondent has taken active steps to sell the disputed domain name through a GoDaddy parking

page in return of a payment amounting to U$ 2.999 before the Complaint was filed.

In the present case - and in the absence of any evidence to documenting out-of-pocket costs in any amount in connection with the disputed domain name - this Panel is satisfied that this amount requested goes far beyond the usual out-of-pocket expenses for registering a .com-domain. Evidence of the offer to sell the domain name prior to the Complainant's filing of a UDRP Complaint is generally admissible under the UDRP, and together with the further facts of this case, enough to show bad faith. The legal criteria for showing bad faith directly specify that an offer for sale can be evidence of bad faith, and the panel is convinced that this offer represents a bad faith effort to extort

This leads to the Panels conclusion that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the primary purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs.

The further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name’s registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- A clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name;
- The Respondent hiding his identity behind a privacy service;
- The disputed domain name being connected to active MX servers, so that Respondent could be engaged in a phishing scheme; and
- The Respondent failing to reply to the pre-complaint warning letter sent by the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **qlikit.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Tobias Malte Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-15

Publish the Decision