

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

QlikTech International AB v. Domain Admin, Domain Privacy Ltd
Case No. D2026-2908

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Admin, Domain Privacy Ltd, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <qlikcertification.com> is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 2, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 July 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Martin Švorčík as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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 is a Swedish company, founded in Sweden in 1993 and operating in the field of data analytics and data integration. The Complainant also provides training and professional certification services relating to its QLIK-branded products, including through its Qlik Learning platform.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for QLIK, including:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 1115948 for QLIK, registered on May 16, 2000, in Classes 9, 35, and 42; and
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 11611126 for QLIK, registered on July 2, 2013, in Classes 9, 35, and 42.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names, including <qlik.com>, <qlik.net> and <qlik.us>. The Complainant uses these domain names to resolve to its official websites, through which it informs Internet users and potential consumers about the QLIK marks and its related services.

The disputed domain name <qlikcertification.com> was registered on June 1, 2026.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected Internet users to unrelated third-party websites, including websites displaying gambling-related and commercial content and to a page prompting users to download software.

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 submits that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its QLIK trademark, which is incorporated in its entirety, while the additional term "certification" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the QLIK trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and is not making a bona fide or legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent registered a domain name incorporating the Complainant's QLIK trademark together with the term "certification", which relates to services offered by the Complainant, and used the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to unrelated third-party websites and to a page prompting users to download software.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "certification", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

The Complainant states that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the QLIK trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The available evidence shows that the disputed domain name was used to redirect Internet users to unrelated third-party websites, including gambling and commercial websites, and to a page prompting users to download software. In the circumstances of this case, such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's trademark and a related term, carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Complainant's trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's QLIK trademark in its entirety together with the term "certification". This reinforces the inference that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name with the Complainant in mind. The evidence shows that the Complainant provides professional certification services in connection with its QLIK-branded products. The Panel considers that the choice of this particular term, in combination with the QLIK trademark, is unlikely to have been coincidental and indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name was used to redirect Internet users to unrelated third-party websites, including gambling and commercial websites, and to a page prompting users to download software. In the circumstances of this case, such use is consistent with an intention to take advantage of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

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 <qlikcertification.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Martin Švorčík/

Martin Švorčík

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2026