

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

QlikTech International AB v. meng zhaoliang  
Case No. D2024-4470

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is meng zhaoliang, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <qlikgame.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 30, 2024. On October 31, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 31, 2024, 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 (xxx) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 1, 2024, 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 November 4, 2024.

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 November 5, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 25, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 26, 2024.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on December 2, 2024. 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 technology company specializing in data analytics and business intelligence solutions. It owns the trademark QLIK, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration (e.g., United States Reg. No. 2657563, registered on December 10, 2002).

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on September 28, 2024. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to set up a website purporting to offer access to online video games.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the QLIK trademark through its registrations (e.g., United States Reg. No. 2657563, registered on December 10, 2002). See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. It incorporates the Complainant's QLIK trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "game" and the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). The addition of "game" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as it is a descriptive term that does not change the overall impression of the mark or its recognizability within the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. It is well established that the gTLD (e.g., ".com") is generally disregarded in the confusing similarity analysis. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondent has not been authorized or licensed to use the QLIK trademark; (2) the Respondent has not been commonly known by the name “Qlik” in any legitimate context; and (3) the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name in connection with a gaming website is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case. The use of the QLIK mark to attract users to a gaming website, capitalizing on the Complainant’s established reputation, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Policy requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith. See Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii).

### **1. Registration in Bad Faith**

The Complainant’s trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name by over 20 years. The distinctive nature of the QLIK mark, combined with the Respondent’s incorporation of the mark in its entirety, strongly suggests that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration. Thus, the Respondent’s selection of a domain name containing the QLIK mark is further evidence that the registration was intended to trade on the Complainant’s reputation and goodwill.

### **2. Use in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to host a website offering online video games is likely to cause confusion among Internet users as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the site with the Complainant. Such conduct falls within the scope of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it demonstrates an intent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

Given the Respondent’s failure to submit a response, there is no evidence to suggest any plausible good faith use of the disputed domain name. In the absence of a credible explanation from the Respondent, the Panel credits the Complainant’s assertions regarding the Respondent’s bad faith registration and use.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 <qlikgame.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Evan D. Brown/*

**Evan D. Brown**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 5, 2024