

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**QlikTech International AB v. Jagannadan Kulala**  
**Case No. D2024-4697**

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is QlikTech International AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Jagannadan Kulala, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <hrqlik.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 14, 2024. On November 14, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 14, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 18, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 18, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint, together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 19, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 9, 2024. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on December 16, 2024.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on December 23, 2024. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

Complainant is a multinational company based in Sweden. For decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered data analysis and related business services under its QLIK mark. Complainant owns several trademark registrations that include the QLIK term as a mark for these services. These registrations include, among others, European Union Trademark Registration No. 012215141 (registered on February 6, 2014) and United States of America Registration No. 4,677,115 (registered on January 27, 2015).

The disputed domain name was registered on October 24, 2024. The disputed domain name is not currently linked to an active website. Respondent nevertheless has no affiliation with Complainant, nor any license to use its marks.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the QLIK mark, for which is Complainant "maintains a robust network of international partners" in its business offerings, and for which Complainant has been recognized as "a Top 10 Innovative Growth Company" by Forbes in 2015. Complainant also contends that it owns the registration for the domain name, <qlik.com>, which Complainant uses to communicate with consumers online, including regarding human resources and hiring for prospective job recruits.

Complainant contends that Respondent has incorporated in full Complainant's QLIK mark into the disputed domain name, with only the addition of the letters "hr", which consumers will likely understand as referencing Complainant's human resources and recruitment services for prospective job recruits. Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, having simply acquired the disputed domain name for Respondent's own commercial gain.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, QLIK, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Although the addition of other terms (here, the letters "hr") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term/s does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although 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 difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Complainant has established rights to the mark incorporated in the disputed domain name, and Respondent has not responded with any valid claim to use those terms. The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s decision, the disputed domain name is not currently linked to an active website. It is nevertheless well established that having a passive website does not necessarily shield a respondent from a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3, which notes that the “non-use of a domain name” does not necessarily negate a finding of bad faith.

Rather, a panel must examine “the totality of the circumstances”, including, for example, whether a complainant has a well-known trademark, and whether a respondent conceals his/her identity and/or replies to the complaint. Respondent here used a privacy service and did not respond to Complainant’s allegations in this proceeding. Complainant has established prior rights in the QLIK mark, as well as media references thereto. Thus, given the apparent distinctiveness and reputation of Complainant’s mark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) of the Policy.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <hrqlik.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Lorelei Ritchie/*

**Lorelei Ritchie**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 6, 2025