

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

QlikTech International AB v. soufiane yemlahi
Case No. DCC2026-0005

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is soufiane yemlahi, Morocco.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <qlikview.cc> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 24, 2026. On March 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 26, 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 (Data Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 26, 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 31, 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 April 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Dilek Zeybel as the sole panelist in this matter on April 28, 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 part of the QlikTech Group, a global provider of artificial intelligence, data analytics, and business intelligence solutions, serving customers worldwide through its advanced analytics platform.

The Complainant's trademark portfolio includes registrations for products and services marketed under the trademarks QLIK and QLIKVIEW.

The trademarks QLIK and QLIKVIEW are protected by trademark registrations in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including but not limited to the following:

- European Union trademark for QLIK Registration No. 001115948, registered on May 16, 2000, in classes 9, 35, and 42;
- International trademark for QLIKVIEW Registration No. 960117, registered on December 5, 2007, in classes 9 and 42; and
- European Union trademark for QLIKVIEW Registration No. 003831427, registered on January 17, 2006, in classes 9, 41 and 42.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names incorporating its QLIK and QLIKVIEW trademarks, including <qlik.com> (created in 1998), <qlik.net> (created in 2002), <qlik.us> (created in 2008), <qlikcommunity.com> (created in 2006), and <qlikview.com> (created in 2000), which are used in connection with the Complainant's official websites and related services.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <qlikview.cc> on February 11, 2026.

At the time of the Panel's review, the disputed domain name did 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.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier registered trademarks QLIK and QLIKVIEW and was registered to create an impression of association with the Complainant and to take unfair advantage of the reputation of its trademarks.

The Complainant argues that Internet searches for the terms "qlikview" and "qlik view" prominently refer to the Complainant and its products and services. According to the Complainant, the Respondent could therefore easily have become aware of the Complainant's trademark rights prior to registering the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant contends that the structure of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's QLIK and QLIKVIEW trademarks in its second-level portion, demonstrates the Respondent's intention to create a false association with the Complainant and a likelihood of confusion among Internet users.

The Complainant also states that the Respondent is not authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks, has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant further asserts that it has no business relationship with the Respondent. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is neither an authorized distributor nor a licensee of the Complainant and has not otherwise been permitted to use the Complainant's trademarks.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is being passively held and that there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant further states that, at the time it became aware of the disputed domain name and sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on February 24, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules directs the Panel as to the principles to be applied in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

The Policy provides, at paragraph 4(a), that each of the three elements must be made for a complaint to prevail:

(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;

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, where a party does not comply with any provision of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate.

Considering the Parties' submissions, the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, the Panel's findings with respect to each of the above elements are set out below.

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's QLIKVIEW trademark. The applicable Top-Level Domain ".cc" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded for the purposes of the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

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 Panel notes that the disputed domain name carries a risk of affiliation with the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Even if the website at the disputed domain name is inactive, such use, if active, would not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and does not and would not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Furthermore, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without the Complainant’s authorization or approval.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website and there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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 Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant’s QLIKVIEW trademark in its entirety, without authorization from the Complainant. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website and that the Respondent has failed to submit any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name. Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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.

The Panel further notes the Complainant's evidence that Internet searches for the terms "qlikview" and "qlik view" prominently refer to the Complainant and its products and services. In these circumstances, the Panel considers it unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

While the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter further supports the Panel's finding of bad faith, it also reinforces the inference that the Respondent lacks any legitimate interest in 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 <qlikview.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dilek Zeybel/

Dilek Zeybel

Sole Panelist

Date: May 12, 2026