

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

QlikTech International AB v. Weijie Xu
Case No. DME2026-0009

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Weijie Xu, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <qlik.me>, <qlikk.me>, <qlikstaige.me>, and <qllik.me> are registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 12, 2026. On August 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 14, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which partially differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED/Weijie Xu) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 19, 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 in English on August 20, 2026.

On August 19, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On August 20, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on September 25, 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 1993, forming part of the QlikTech Group, one of the global leaders in artificial intelligence, data analytics and business intelligence solutions, offering software to businesses worldwide. As of 2026, the Complainant states that the QlikTech Group serves more than 40,000 customers worldwide and maintains a network of international partners including Amazon, Google and Microsoft. The QlikTech Group has a global presence, with offices in North America, Canada, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, Asia and Africa, where it has an active presence through associated companies and its partners, including in the United States of America ("United States"), where their headquarters are based.

The Complainant offers various products and services under the QLIK trade mark, and has the following trade mark registrations for QLIK and QLIK STAIGE, namely:

- United States trade mark Registration No. 2657563 for QLIK in Class 9, registered on December 10, 2002;
- International trade mark Registration No. 839118 for QLIK in Classes 9, 35, and 42, registered on May 14, 2004, designating, inter alia, Australia, China, New Zealand, Norway and Russian Federation;
- China trade mark Registration No. 74709433 for QLIK STAIGE in Class 35, registered on March 28, 2024;
- China trade mark Registration No. 74707917 for QLIK STAIGE in Class 38, registered on March 28, 2024; and
- United States trade mark Registration No. 7806214 for QLIK STAIGE in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42, and 45, registered on May 27, 2025.

The Complainant or its related companies operate multiple domain names incorporating the QLIK and QLIK STAIGE trade mark, including <qlik.com> (created on March 17, 1998) and <qlikstaige.com> (created on August 31, 2023).

The disputed domain names <qliik.me> and <qlik.me> were registered on June 25, 2026, and <qlikk.me> and <qlikstaige.me> were registered on June 30, 2026. The Complainant has submitted evidence showing the disputed domain names all resolved to a "for sale" landing page offering to sell the disputed domain names. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names continued to resolve to the same "for sale" landing pages, offering each disputed domain name for sale at the price of USD 1,450.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names <qlik.me>, <qliik.me>, and <qlikk.me> are typosquatted variations of the Complainant's QLIK trade mark, and that the disputed domain name <qlikstaige.me> has included the Complainant's QLIK STAIGE trade mark in its entirety, and that all the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's QLIK and QLIK STAIGE marks.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trade marks. There is no evidence showing that the Respondent has been using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering or have made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, but rather, as the Complainant further contends, has offered them for sale.

The Complainant also claims that there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to the QLIK and QLIK STAIGE marks, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain names. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain names must be in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for the following main reasons:

- The disputed domain names resolve to webpages in English on which the respective disputed domain names are offered for sale. This provides further indication that the Respondent is able to understand English and/or has chosen to use an English-language platform in connection with the disputed domain names.
- The Complainant is based in Sweden. As English is commonly used internationally, it would be fair to both Parties for the language of the present proceeding to be English.
- A translation of the Complaint to Chinese would entail significant additional costs for the Complainant and would also delay the proceeding.

The Respondent did not file a Response or any submission with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the above factors, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the QLIK and QLIK STAIGE trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Disregarding the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".me", the Panel finds that the Complainant's QLIK mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names <qlik.me>, <qliik.me>, and <qlikk.me>. It is well established that "a domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. Here, the disputed domain names consist of misspellings of the Complainant's QLIK trade mark:

- <qlik.me>: The Respondent added an extra letter "l";
- <qliik.me>: The Respondent added an extra letter "i"; and
- <qlikk.me>: The Respondent added an extra letter "k".

The Panel finds the QLIK mark is recognizable within these disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names <qlik.me>, <qliik.me>, and <qlikk.me> are confusingly similar to the QLIK mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

With regard to the disputed domain name <qlikstaige.me>, disregarding the ccTLD ".me", the disputed domain name is comprised of the term "qlikstaige", which is identical to the Complainant's QLIK STAIGE trade mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the QLIK and QLIK STAIGE trade marks and in showing that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its marks.

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.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade mark and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Respondent did not file a Response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or other legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated or connected with the Complainant in any manner, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant's QLIK and QLIK STAIGE trade marks. The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint and did not provide any information or factors that could potentially establish prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Furthermore, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has engaged in any legitimate noncommercial or bona fide use of the disputed domain names.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names.

In the present case, the disputed domain names <qlikk.me>, <qliik.me>, and <qlikk.me> consist of misspellings of the Complainant's QLIK trade mark. The disputed domain names are visually very similar to the Complainant's QLIK trade mark. Given the nature of the misspellings and the fact that the Complainant's QLIK trade mark remain readily recognizable within these disputed domain names, the Panel finds that this constitutes typosquatting. It is well established that the practice of typosquatting domain names targeting well-known trademarks can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

With regards to the disputed domain name <qlikstaige.me>, the Panel finds that the registration of this disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's QLIK STAIGE trade mark in its entirety indicates the Respondent's clear awareness of the Complainant's rights in the QLIK and QLIK STAIGE trade marks.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names for the purpose of selling each of them for an amount in excess of its out-of-pocket costs relating to the registrations of the disputed domain names. The Respondent has without explanation registered the disputed domain names, which are confusingly similar or identical to the Complainant's QLIK and QLIK STAIGE trade marks. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain names, other than to offer each of them for sale for a significant sum. In the absence of any explanation or any plausible good faith reasons, the Panel concludes that the Respondent was motivated by an awareness of the QLIK and QLIK STAIGE trade marks and intended to sell them for a sum greater than any out-of-pocket costs related to the disputed domain names. Pursuant to 4(b)(i) of the Policy, the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 names <qliik.me>, <qlikk.me>, <qlikstaige.me>, and <qlikk.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: October 9, 2026