ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

QlikTech International AB v. Ochanji
Case No. D2026-3150

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ochanji, Kenya.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <qlik.cloud> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 16, 2026. On July 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 20, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 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 July 23, 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 August 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 31, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Alfred Meijboom as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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

Founded in Sweden in 1993, the Complainant is a global leader in artificial intelligence, data analytics, and business intelligence solutions, offering software to businesses worldwide. The Complainant forms part of the QlikTech Group with its headquarters in the United States of America, which serves more than 40,000 global customers, has more than 235,000 community members, and maintains a network of international partners, including Amazon, Google, and Microsoft. The QlikTech Group has a global presence, with offices in North America, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. The QlikTech Group offers, inter alia, "Qlik Cloud" which is a cloud-based data integration and analytics platform enabling organizations to move, integrate, analyze, and visualize data from on-premises and cloud sources.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for QLIK and QLIK CLOUD in different jurisdictions, including:

- European Union Trade Mark QLIK with registration number 001115948 of May 16, 2000, for goods and services in classes 9, 35 and 42;
- International registration for QLIK with registration number 839118 of May 14, 2004, for goods and services in classes 9, 35 and 42; and
- European Union Trade Mark QLIK CLOUD with registration number 014437982 of November 19, 2015, for goods and services in classes 9, 35 and 42.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names, including <qlik.com> which was registered in 1998, and <qlikcloud.com>, which was registered in 2014.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 1, 2026, and resolves to a website which offers the disputed domain name for sale for USD 3,838.

In absence of contact details of the Respondent, the Complainant sent the Respondent a cease and desist letter on June 19, 2026, via the Registrar, requesting it to forward the letter to the Respondent. In the absence of a response, the Complainant sent further reminders to the Registrar on July 1 and 6, 2026, to which no response was received either.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that its QLIK trademark is wholly incorporated in the disputed domain name, and when considering the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".cloud", the disputed domain name calls to mind the Complainant's QLIK CLOUD trademark, and, when viewed together with the second-level portion "qlik", creates a clear and targeted association with the Complainant's business.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized by, licensed by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant or any of its subsidiaries, and the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name and does not own associated trademark rights. The Complainant further contends that that there is no indication that the Respondent used or made demonstrable preparations to use the terms "qlik.cloud" or "qlik cloud" in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the structure of the disputed domain name – incorporating in its second level portion the Complainant's trademark QLIK in its entirety – is inherently misleading and reflects the Respondent's intention to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, with the Complainant and its trademarks in Internet users' minds. The Complainant also considers the Respondent's information as disclosed by the Registrar to further reinforce that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not identified with a full name and the address consists solely of a number without a verifiable physical address provided, and the Respondent has not responded to the Complainant's communication.

According to the Complainant the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because the structure of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's distinctive QLIK trademark and, if considered with the TLD, QLIK CLOUD trademark in its entirety, clearly reflects the Respondent's intention to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, in Internet users' mind. The Complainant further alleges that, by conducting a simple online search regarding the disputed domain name terms "qlik.cloud" or "qlik cloud," the Respondent would have inevitably learnt about the Complainant, its trademarks and business. Therefore, the Complainant asserts that it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its QLIK and QLIK CLOUD trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith because the QLIK trademark is well-known so that the registration of the disputed domain name which wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. And also because the disputed domain name resolves to a domain name marketplace where it is offered for sale for an amount which is likely to be substantially in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs indicate that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it for valuable consideration in excess of such costs. Moreover the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has been engaged in a pattern of domain name registrations preventing the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name (Paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy) because the Respondent seems to be the same as the respondent in *H. Lundbeck A/S v. Samuel Ochanji, Carthage Domain Solutions*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1483, and the Complainant submitted evidence of the Respondent having registered a domain name which wholly incorporates a third party trademark (which domain name is currently not subject to UDRP proceedings). According to the Complainant all these circumstances demonstrate that the Respondent's primary intention in registering the disputed domain name is to sell it for an amount exceeding its out-of-pocket costs, while taking advantage of its association with the Complainant's trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Respondent did not file a Response. However, as set out in section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), the consensus view of UDRP panels is that the respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the complainant. The Complainant must still establish each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Although the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default, paragraph 4 of the Policy requires the Complainant to support its assertions with actual evidence in order to succeed in these proceedings. Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the panel shall draw such inferences as it considers appropriate from a failure of a party to comply with a provision or requirement of the Rules. The Panel finds that in this case there are no such exceptional circumstances.

Under the Policy, the Complainant must prove 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 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 TLD in a domain name, in this case ".cloud," is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. The meaning of the TLD may however be relevant to panel assessment of the second and third elements. However, where the applicable TLD and the second-level portion of the domain name in combination contain the relevant trademark, panels may consider the domain name in its entirety for purposes of assessing confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

The entirety of the Complainant's QLIK trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, just as the entirety of the Complainant's QLIK CLOUD trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the second-level portion of the disputed domain name and the TLD ".cloud" are identical to the Complainant's QLIK CLOUD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.11.3.

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 these proceedings the fact that the TLD ".cloud" relates to the Complainant's QLIK CLOUD trademark, resulting in the disputed domain name being identical to the Complainant's QLIK and QLIK CLOUD trademarks with and without the TLD, results in the finding that the Respondent's selection of the TLD reinforces a finding that the Respondent obtained the disputed domain name to take advantage of the Complainant's trademarks, and as such that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.14.1.

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 did not submit evidence that supports a finding of the QLIK trademark being well-known (the Panel noting that a finding by a panel in another UDRP case that the Complainant's trademark is well-known does not, in and of itself, constitute proof of reputation), the Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the QLIK trademark is distinctive and establishes an exclusive connection with the Complainant. From the fact that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's distinctive QLIK and QLIK CLOUD trademarks, the Panel infers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its trademark in mind.

The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain name is used in bad faith as the Respondent offers the disputed domain name for sale for valuable consideration which the Respondent has not denied being in excess of the out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name as meant in paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. Furthermore, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the Complainant, as owner of the QLIK and QLIK CLOUD trademarks, from reflecting the trademarks in a corresponding domain name, and has engaged in a pattern of such conduct as demonstrated by the Complainant to the Panel's satisfaction.[1] Although given the opportunity to provide a defense against these allegations, the Respondent has not done so.

The Panel therefore 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 <qlik.cloud> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alfred Meijboom/
Alfred Meijboom
Sole Panelist
Date: September 16, 2026

---

[1] Further to the Complainant's contentions regarding a pattern of trademark abusive domain names registered by the Respondent, the Panel also notes another recent and particularly relevant UDRP proceeding in which the Respondent registered a domain name identical to a complainant's mark under the ".cloud" TLD and offered the domain name for sale. See *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Ochanji*, WIPO Case No. D2026-2412. Under the general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, a panel may undertake limited factual research into public records if such information is useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview 3.1, WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8.