

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

QlikTech International AB v. Mesut Erdogan
Case No. D2026-0967

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Mesut Erdogan, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <qlikanswers.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 6, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 9, 2026, 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 (“REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 9, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 13, 2026.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 2026. 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

The Complainant, QlikTech International AB, is a Swedish company founded in 1993, forming part of the QlikTech Group, a global provider of artificial intelligence, data analytics, and business intelligence solutions. As of 2026, the Complainant states that the QlikTech Group serves more than 40,000 customers worldwide and maintains a network of international partners including Amazon, Google and Microsoft. The QlikTech Group has offices in over 30 jurisdictions across North America, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, Asia and Africa, and an active commercial presence in Türkiye through partners.

The Complainant offers, among other products and services under the QLIK trademark, a service called “Qlik Answers”, described as an AI-assisted decision and productivity assistant.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for QLIK, including:

- European Union Trademark No. 001115948 for QLIK, registered on May 16, 2000;
- International Registration No. 839118 for QLIK, registered on May 14, 2004, designating, inter alia, Türkiye;
- United States Trademark No. 2657563 for QLIK, registered on December 10, 2002.

The Complainant also owns European Union Trademark No. 019030000 for QLIK ANSWERS, filed on May 21, 2024, and registered on September 14, 2024.

The Complainant operates several domain names incorporating its QLIK trademark, including <qlik.com> (created on March 17, 1998) and <qlik.net> (created on November 25, 2002), through which it informs Internet users about its products and services. A previous UDRP panel has acknowledged that the QLIK trademark is well-known (see *QlikTech International AB v. BENZAKOUR ABDELALI*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5123](#)).

The disputed domain name <qlikanswers.com> was registered on May 21, 2024 - the same day the Complainant filed its European Union trademark application for QLIK ANSWERS. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page hosted at GoDaddy.com offering the disputed domain name for sale at the price of USD 2,988.

On February 3, 2026, the Complainant sent a Notification of Violation of Trademark Rights letter, both to the Registrar’s abuse email address and through the Registrar’s contact-request web form. The Respondent did not reply.

According to the registrar verification response, the Respondent is mesut erdogan, with a contact address in Ankara, Türkiye. The record before the Panel includes evidence that the Respondent has previously been the named respondent in UDRP proceedings brought by the Complainant in respect of similar conduct, namely *QlikTech International AB v. mesut Erdogan*, CAC-UDRP-107622 (concerning, inter alia, <qlikcloudanalytics.com> and <qlikautomate.com>) and *QlikTech International AB and TALEND S.A.S. v. mesut Erdogan*, CAC-UDRP-107973.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its QLIK ANSWERS trademark and confusingly similar to its QLIK trademark, the latter being well-known internationally; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, having no license or authorization from the Complainant, no demonstrable bona fide use, and offering the disputed domain name

for sale at a price (USD 2,988) likely exceeding any out-of-pocket costs; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, the registration having been effected on the very day of the Complainant's European Union trademark application for QLIK ANSWERS, which the Complainant submits cannot be a coincidence and forms part of a pattern of abusive registrations targeting the Complainant and other brand owners.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademarks QLIK and QLIK ANSWERS for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the QLIK ANSWERS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", which is a standard registration requirement and may typically be ignored when assessing identity or confusing similarity ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11), the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's QLIK ANSWERS trademark.

Considered alternatively in relation to the QLIK trademark alone, the disputed domain name reproduces that mark in its entirety, with the addition of the descriptive term "answers". The Panel finds that the QLIK mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and that the addition of the term "answers" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel notes for completeness that the QLIK ANSWERS trademark was applied for on the same date the disputed domain name was registered. Under the consistent case law, the question whether the Complainant's trademark rights pre-date or post-date the disputed domain name does not affect the standing assessment under the first element; it may be relevant only to the analysis of the second and third elements. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

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 that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, the record shows that: (i) the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its QLIK or QLIK ANSWERS trademark, and there is no relationship of any kind between the parties; (ii) there is no evidence that the Respondent (mesut erdogan) is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that he holds any registered rights including the terms QLIK or QLIK ANSWERS; (iii) public search results returning information on the terms "qlik answers" point exclusively to the Complainant and its services, and a combined search for "qlik answers" and the Respondent's name yields no result associating the Respondent with such terms; and (iv) the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page offering it for sale for USD 2,988, an amount likely in excess of any out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

The Panel further considers that the disputed domain name, being identical to the Complainant's QLIK ANSWERS trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute fair use, as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The mere offering of the disputed domain name for sale at a price likely exceeding out-of-pocket costs, coupled with the absence of any demonstrable preparation to use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

As a preliminary matter, the Panel addresses the question of timing. The disputed domain name was registered on May 21, 2024, the same day the Complainant filed its European Union trademark application for QLIK ANSWERS. Where a domain name is registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights, panels generally would not find bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1. However, this principle does not apply where the facts establish that the respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant's nascent or anticipated trademark rights — a recognized exception under [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2. In the Panel's view, the present case falls squarely within that exception.

Several factors lead the Panel to that conclusion. First, the Complainant's QLIK trademark was registered as far back as 2000 in the European Union, has been used continuously and extensively since, and has been recognized by a previous UDRP panel as well-known (*QlikTech International AB v. BENZAKOUR ABDELALI*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5123](#)). It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant or its QLIK mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

Second, the precise coincidence between the date of registration of the disputed domain name and the date of the Complainant's European Union application for QLIK ANSWERS — including, on the record before the Panel, registration on the very same day — is not consistent with chance. The Panel adopts the reasoning of the panel in *QlikTech International AB v. mesut Erdogan*, CAC-UDRP-107622, where, on materially identical facts involving the same Respondent and other QLIK-formative marks (QLIK CLOUD ANALYTICS and QLIK AUTOMATE), the panel found that such precise timing supported a strong inference that the Respondent had prior knowledge of the Complainant's marks or impending filings, and evidenced deliberate targeting of the Complainant and its intellectual property.

Third, the Respondent's conduct in the present proceeding fits a documented pattern. The record before the Panel discloses that the Respondent has been the subject of prior UDRP decisions concerning analogous domain names targeting the Complainant (*QlikTech International AB v. mesut Erdogan*, CAC-UDRP-107622 and *QlikTech International AB and TALEND S.A.S. v. mesut Erdogan*, CAC-UDRP-107973), as well as further proceedings involving other brand owners on similar fact patterns where domain name registrations coincided with trademark applications before the EUIPO. This is a classic pattern of abusive registration of domain names corresponding to the marks of multiple brand owners falling within paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

On the basis of these factors, taken cumulatively, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its rights specifically in mind, in order to capitalize on those rights, and accordingly that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As regards use in bad faith, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page offering it for sale at the price of USD 2,988, which is manifestly in excess of any plausible out-of-pocket cost directly related to the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the present circumstances fall squarely within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy: the disputed domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring it for valuable consideration likely in excess of out-of-pocket costs.

Bad faith use is further supported by the Respondent's use of a privacy service to conceal his identity in the Whois records, which the Panel considers, in the circumstances of this case and combined with the other elements identified above, to be an additional indicium of bad faith (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Instagram, LLC v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Murat Sander*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0526](#)).

Finally, the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's pre-action notification or to file any Response in these proceedings — having received notice in accordance with the Rules — is consistent with the absence of any plausible good-faith justification for the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element 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 <qlikanswers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elise Dufour/

Elise Dufour

Sole Panelist

Date: April 30, 2026