

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

QlikTech International AB v. Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc
Case No. DME2025-0012

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <qlik.me> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Communigal Communications Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 12, 2025. On May 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 14, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which partly differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED, Domain Name Privacy Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 15, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 16, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 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

Complainant is a global leader in artificial intelligence, data analytics, and business intelligence solutions, offering software to businesses worldwide. Through its innovative platform Complainant enables businesses to transform raw data into actionable insights, enabling them to gain a deeper understanding of their operations, customers, and market trends. Complainant was founded in Sweden in 1993, and forms part of the QlikTech Group.

As of 2025, the QlikTech Group serves more than 40,000 global customers and has more than 235,000 community members. The QlikTech Group also maintains a robust network of international partners, including Amazon, Google, and Microsoft.

The QlikTech Group has a global presence, with offices in Africa, Asia, Canada, Europe, Latin America, North America, and the Middle East.

Complainant is the owner of the QLIK Mark and owns multiple trademark registrations for the QLIK Mark in different jurisdictions. The trademark registrations predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name which was created on December 26, 2024. Complainant's QLIK Mark registrations include, without limitation:

European Union Trademark Registration No. 001115948 for QLIK, registered on May 16, 2000, in Nice classifications 9, 35 and 42;

United States of America Trademark Registration No. 2657563 for QLIK, registered on December 10, 2002, in primary class 9; and

International Trademark Registration No. 839118 for QLIK, registered on May 14, 2004, in Nice classifications 9, 35, and 42.

Previous UDRP panels have acknowledged that the QLIK Mark is owned by Complainant and well known. Complainant also owns numerous domain names composed of QLIK, including <qlik.com> (created March 17, 1998) and <qlik.net> (created November 25, 2002). These domain names resolve to Complainant's official website.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 26, 2024, and resolves to a website with pay-per-click ("PPC") links which offer artificial intelligence services similar to those available from Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the QLIK Mark. Complainant further contends that the use of the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".me" can be ignored as part of any assessment of confusing similarity.

Complainant submits that Respondent has never been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant further submits that, given the fact that the QLIK Mark is well known, Respondent knew or should have known of Complainant's rights in the QLIK Mark before Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant further submits that Respondent is intentionally trying to benefit from Complainant's worldwide renown of the QLIK Mark and to confuse Internet users as to the source of the Disputed Domain Name. Complainant further submits that such use by Respondent can be neither bona fide nor legitimate.

Complainant further submits that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website with PPC links, and which mentions Complainant together with business activities such as “analytics software,” “business intelligence,” and “data visualization” – all of which are services offered by Complainant.

Complainant further submits that it has sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent but has received no reply.

Complainant alleges that it has never authorized Respondent to use the QLIK Mark in a domain name or in any other way.

Complainant further alleges that the actions of Respondent violate paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, constituting bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant further alleges that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive domain name registrations and was found to have registered infringing domain names in multiple previous UDRP proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 3.1.2. Complaint further alleges that Respondent has registered the domain names <airfrance.us> and <dollargeneral-careers.com> among others. In addition, Respondent has registered the domain name <qliksense.online> in an effort to intentionally target Complainant and another of its trademarks QLIK SENSE.

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three essential elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use 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.”

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant’s assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are met. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three essential elements:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the QLIK Mark in which Complainant has rights; and,
- ii) that 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

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration is prima facie evidence of Complainant having enforceable rights in the QLIK Mark.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the QLIK Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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 QLIK Mark and the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The entirety of the QLIK Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the QLIK Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the addition of the ccTLD “.me” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the QLIK Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the QLIK Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 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 the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the QLIK Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, you [Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the QLIK Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users to a PPC website with the links to services similar to those available from Complainant, using the Disputed Domain Name which is identical to the QLIK Mark. The Panel finds such actions to meet the criteria of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy which constitutes bad faith.

The Panel finds that 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.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: July 1, 2025