Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107973

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107973
Time of filing	2025-09-22 10:04:16
Domain names	qliktalendcloud.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	QlikTech International AB
Organization	TALEND S.A.S.

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 relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainants have adduced evidence showing that they own the following trademarks in respect of the brand names QLIK and TALEND:

QLIK:

- International trademark No. 1781507, registered on 20 December 2023;
- International trademark No. 839118, registered on 14 May 2004;
- EU trademark No. 001115948, registered on 16 May 2000;
- US trademark No. 3114427, registered on 11 July 2006.

TALEND:

- International trademark No. 1345814, registered on 7 March 2017;
- EU trademark No. 014226989, registered on 23 September 2015;
- US trademark No. 5304787, registered on 10 October 2017.

QLIK TALEND:

- EU trademark No. 019028371, registered on 14 September 2024.

QLIK TALEND CLOUD:

- EU trademark No. 019039723, registered on 10 October 2024.

The above trademarks were registered variously in Nice Classification classes 9, 35 or 42, and most were registered in all three of these classes.

The Complainants provided screenshots of the website at <qlik.com> but no documentation is provided showing the Complainant's registration of this domain name.

The disputed domain name <qliktalendcloud.com> was registered on 26 May 2025, according to the Registrar Verification requested by the CAC Case Administrator.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The QlikTech Group is a global leader in artificial intelligence, data analytics and business intelligence solutions, offering software to businesses worldwide. The first Complainant, QlikTech International AB, was founded in Sweden in 1993. In 2023, the QlikTech Group acquired Talend S.A.S, a provider of open-source data integration and data quality solutions. Talend is the second Complainant in this proceeding. The QlikTech Group provides various services under the QLIK and TALEND trademarks, including Qlik Talend Cloud and Qlik Talend Trust Score. 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 that includes Amazon, Google and Microsoft.

The Complainant adduced screenshot evidence showing that the disputed domain name is being offered on a parking page with a buy-now price of USD 2,988 and that the Respondent has been the object of several previous ADR proceedings. In exercise of its general powers, the Panel verified that findings against the Respondent had indeed been made by earlier ADR Panels.

The Complainant sought to send a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, with reminders, but this initiative produced no reaction from the Respondent.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainants' QLIK and TALEND trademarks are clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name, while the further trademark QLIK TALEND CLOUD is identical to the disputed domain name's entire stem. For its part, the generic Top-Level Domain extension <.com> can be disregarded. The disputed domain name is hence confusingly similar to the Complainants' QLIK and TALEND trademarks and identical to their QLIK TALEND CLOUD trademark.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name

Neither of the Complainants has granted the Respondent any authorization to use its protected brands. Nor is the Respondent known by the disputed domain name. Instead, the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is being offered for sale. Correspondingly, the disputed domain name cannot be regarded as being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and there is also no indication that the Respondent has put the disputed domain name to any legitimate non-commercial or fair use; to the contrary, the Respondent has sought through the disputed domain name illegitimately to contrive a non-existent connection to the Complainants. The Respondent accordingly has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainants' trademarks are widely known and registered in many countries and the Complainants enjoy a strong online presence. It is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainants when it registered the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the structure of the disputed domain name's stem to include the Complainants' trademarks shows that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with their business and trademarks in mind to create likely confusion in Internet users' minds. As to the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, its offer for sale at a price likely in excess of the Respondent's directly related out-of-pocket costs is an instance of bad faith use consistent with the UDRP's non-exhaustive list of examples. Lastly, the Complainants have shown that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of domain name abuse. The Respondent therefore registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainants have rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainants have, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainants have, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that 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 the UDRP were met and that there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

The Panel notes that its résumé of the Parties' contentions includes for the Complainant only its main ones pertinent to reaching a decision in this proceeding; it omits in particular references to past ADR Panels' Decisions that support these contentions as well as contentions of only secondary probative value.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

This is a case in which the dominant two first components of the disputed domain name -- the brands QLIK and TALEND -- are both distinctive and well-known. Between them, "QLIK" has the particular feature of being a branding construct that employs orthographic manipulation to produce the same spoken sound as another term, "click", yet at the same time generates a distinctive optical term in itself. The joining of the two brands QLIK and TALEND with the addition of a third generic term, "cloud", that is itself trademarked in that same combinative form and which constitutes one of the Complainants' services, leaves scarce room for doubt that, as the Complainant contends, the disputed name was devised and registered precisely to exploit the Complainant's protected brands and its reputation. Nor did the Respondent's means of exploitation stretch the imagination. The method used was, following registration, simply to use the registrar's parking page ISP facilities to offer the disputed domain name at a price far above what must have been the direct out-of-pocket expenses that the Respondent incurred.

This is hence a clear instance of cybersquatting for gain. There is no question in the circumstances of this case of there being any legitimate purpose to the Respondent's enterprise in registering and using the disputed domain name. Those circumstances instead show manifest bad faith.

The Panel takes note of the record of cases in which previous ADR Panels have found against the Respondent. But, on the basis of the above and even without considering such antecedents, the Panel has no hesitation in FINDING that all the elements of the UDRP's three-part cumulative test have been amply met in this proceeding.

The Panel therefore ORDERS the transfer of the disputed domain name to the first-named Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **qliktalendcloud.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Kevin Madders**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-11-09

Publish the Decision