

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

QlikTech International AB v. Dhanvin Sriram
Case No. DAI2025-0016

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Dhanvin Sriram, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 30, 2025. On May 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 3, 2025, 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 May 6, 2025, 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 May 7, 2025.

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 May 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 2025. 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 was founded in Sweden in 1993 and is part of the QlikTech Group, a global leader in artificial intelligence, data analytics and business intelligence solutions, offering software to businesses worldwide under the trademark QLIK.

The Complainant's group has a robust network of international partners and a global presence, with offices in North America, Canada, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, Asia and Africa. Specifically in the United States and the United Arab Emirates, the group has an active presence through associated companies, offices and partners.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for QLIK, including the following, as per trademark registration details submitted as annexes 5 to the Complaint:

- International trademark registration No. 839118 for QLIK (word mark), registered on May 14, 2004, in classes 9, 35 and 42;
- European Union trademark registration No. 001115948 for QLIK (word mark), filed on March 23, 1999, and registered on May 16, 2000, in classes 9, 35 and 42;
- European Union trademark registration No. 011611126 for QLIK (word mark), filed on February 27, 2013, and registered on July 2, 2013, in classes 9, 35 and 42;
- United States of America trademark registration No. 3114427 for QLIK (word mark), filed on May 14, 2004, and registered on July 11, 2006, in international classes 9, 35 and 42;
- United Arab Emirates trademark registration No. 209493 QLIK (figurative mark), filed on April 8, 2014, and registered on May 29, 2016, in class 42; and
- United Arab Emirates trademark registration No. 209491 QLIK (figurative mark), filed on April 8, 2014, and registered on May 29, 2016, in class 9.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names encompassing QLIK, including <qlik.com>, registered on March 17, 1998, and <qlik.ae>, which redirects to the domain name <qlik.com>, used by the Complainant to promote its products and services under the trademark QLIK.

The disputed domain name <qlik.ai> was registered on December 16, 2017, and does not resolve to an active website.

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 by virtue of its prior trademark registrations, the disputed domain name is identical to the trademark QLIK in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".ai".

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since: i) the Complainant has never granted the Respondent any rights to use the QLIK trademark in any form, including in the disputed domain name; ii) the Respondent does not have any trademark rights for, nor is it commonly known by, the disputed domain name; iii) considering the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark, has been registered in the ".ai" ccTLD which is popular with companies working in the artificial intelligence industry like the Complainant, and has been passively held, the Respondent has not been using, or made preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that considering its prior registration of the QLIK mark and its goodwill and world renown, by registering the disputed domain name, identical to the Complainant's trademark, in the ccTLD ".ai", which is popular with companies working in the artificial intelligence industry, the Respondent has demonstrated knowledge and familiarity with the Complainant's trademark and business. The Complainant further asserts that, given that the Respondent is an entrepreneur operating in the artificial intelligence and analytics industry, and as the Complainant is a global leader in artificial intelligence and data analytics solutions, it was likely aware of the Complainant and its QLIK mark.

The Complainant further states that, although the disputed domain name was registered on December 16, 2017, it was likely acquired by the Respondent via an expired domain name auction in March 2024, seeking to benefit from the Complainant's established reputation and potentially harm its business by diverting traffic to a different website. The Complainant submits that, though the disputed domain name is being passively held, the structure of the disputed domain name reflects the Respondent's intention to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, with the Complainant, its QLIK trademark and the Complainant in Internet users' mind, since by reading the disputed domain name, Internet users may believe that it is directly connected to or authorized by the Complainant.

The Complainant also claims that the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and its attempt to hide its identity by employing a Whois privacy service, further demonstrate the Respondent's bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for the word mark QLIK in several jurisdictions.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the mere addition of the ccTLD ".ai", which can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 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.

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 Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant's trademark.

Furthermore, there is no indication before the Panel that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, has made preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or that it intends to make a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is currently passively held. In view of the Respondent's default, the Panel shares the view held in *Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America v. Wreaks Communications Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0483](#), where the panel found that, absent some contrary evidence from a respondent, passive holding of a domain name does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

In addition to the above, the disputed domain name, being identical to the Complainant's well-known trademark QLIK, is inherently misleading as it carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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 Panel finds that, in light of the prior registration and use of the Complainant's trademark QLIK in connection with the Complainant's activity and products, including artificial intelligence, data analytics and business intelligence solutions, offering software to businesses worldwide and promoted online via the Complainant's website at the domain name <qlik.com>, and considering the well-known character of the trademark in its sector, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

Indeed, the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark and the selection of the ccTLD “.ai”, which is strongly relatable to the Complainant's field of activity being a common abbreviation for “Artificial Intelligence”, suggest that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant at the time of registering the disputed domain name and intended to target the Complainant and its trademark.

The disputed domain name is not redirected to an active website and is passively held. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes: i) the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, ii) the identity of the disputed domain name with such trademark and the registration in the “.ai” ccTLD referable to “Artificial Intelligence”, a field in which the Complainant operates, and iii) the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and to file a Response to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: June 23, 2025