1. The Parties and Contested Domain Name

The Complainant is **Klook Travel Technology Limited** whose registered office is situate at 32 Hollywood Road, 22/F Kinwick Centre, Central, Hong Kong; and its authorized representative in this matter is Corporation Service Company acted by Paddy Tam of CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB whose address is situate at Drottninggatan 92-94, 111 36 Stockholm, Sweden.

The Respondent is 段佐春 (duan zuo chun) whose address is situated at 广东省珠海市珠海大道1号华发新城四期139栋215房, 519000, China.

The domain name at issue is <klook.hk> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) registered with **Nicenic International Group Co., Ltd. (the “Registrar”)** whose address is situate at Unit D, 16/F., One Capital Place, 18, Luard Road, Wanchai, Hong Kong.

2. Procedural History

On 25 October 2019, Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (“HKIAC”) received a complaint (subsequently revised on 20 November 2019) (“the Complaint”) filed by the Complainant pursuant to the Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”) adopted by the Hong Kong Domain Name Internet Registration Corporation Limited (“HKIRC”) on 22 February 2011, the HKIRC
Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy Rules of Procedure (the “Rules”) approved by HKIRC on 22 February 2011 and the HKIAC Supplemental Rules (the “Supplemental Rules”) effective from 1 March 2011.

On 4 November 2019, HKIAC transmitted by email to the Registrar, a request for registrar verification in connection with the WHOIS of the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name.

By an email on 7 November 2019, the Registrar confirmed that the Respondent is the registrant or holder of the Disputed Domain Name; and that the Policy is applicable to the current dispute; and provided HKIAC with the WHOIS information regarding the Disputed Domain Name, including the administrative and technical contacts of the Respondent.

On 20 November 2019, HKIAC served on the Respondent by email the Notification of Commencement of Proceedings (“NCP”) and that the Respondent had 15 business days, on or before 11 December 2019, to submit a Response to the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules. The Complaint and its annexures were attached to the NCP issued by HKIAC.

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint by the due date; and on 13 December 2019, HKIAC issued a notification of the Respondent in Default.

On 16 December 2019, HKIAC appointed Mr. Raymond HO as the sole Panelist of the Arbitration Panel in this matter. The said sole Panelist had, prior to the appointment, submitted his Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence in compliance with the Rules; and the case file was transferred by HKIAC to the said sole Panelist on the same date.

3. Factual Background

The Complainant, incorporated in Hong Kong in 2014, operates the well-known “Klook” booking platform for travel activities and related services that facilitates users to find, reserve and book online for tours, transportation and tickets for attractions from more than 10,000 vendors in 350 destinations. In March 2015, the Complainant launched its mobile app featured on Apple iTunes store across Asia. The Klook app is now rated 4.8 out of 5 by users at the Apple store, and has been downloaded from Goggle Play by more than 1 million users. The Complainant’s primary website at <klook.com> attracts 30 million visits a month. According to Alexa.com, <klook.com> is ranked as the 3,358th most popular website globally.

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name <klook.hk> on 31 May 2019 for one year up to 31 May 2020.
4. Parties’ Contentions

A. The Complainant

The Complainant’s contentions are summarized as follows:

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in Hong Kong in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant says that it is the owner of the registered trademark “KLOOK 客路” in Hong Kong. The Complainant adds that its Singapore affiliate company, Klook Travel Technology Pte. Ltd., is the owner of the trademark registrations for “KLOOK” on a worldwide basis, including Singapore, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

There are exhibited in Annex 1 to the Complaint extracted copies of the trademark registrations listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Mark</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Date of Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KLOOK 客路</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>303474108</td>
<td>35, 38, 39, 42</td>
<td>07-16-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLOOK 客路</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>304442247</td>
<td>9, 41</td>
<td>02-26-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLOOK</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>40201619046W</td>
<td>39, 42</td>
<td>09-11-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLOOK</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>40201801143V</td>
<td>9, 35, 41</td>
<td>01-18-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLOOK</td>
<td>WIPO*</td>
<td>1420087</td>
<td>9, 35, 39, 41, 42</td>
<td>01-26-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLOOK</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5796926</td>
<td>9, 35, 39, 41, 42</td>
<td>07-09-2019**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Designating BX, DE, ES, FR, GB, IN, IT, JP, NZ, PH, TH, VN.
**Priority date: 01-18-2018

The Complainant submits that where it holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, such holding prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a complaint under the Policy. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“WIPO Overview 3.0”) at paragraph 1.2.1.

The Complainant also submits that when comparing the Disputed Domain Name to Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademark, the relevant comparison to be made is only between the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name and Complainant’s trademark. The second-level domain of the Disputed Domain Name contains the entire word “KLOOK” of the Complainant’s trademark as its only distinctive component that is confusingly similar, if not identical, to Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademark. See WIPO Overview 3.0 at paragraph 1.7 and Alibaba Group Holding Limited & Alibaba Group Services Limited v.
Further, it is the Complainant’s contention that “客路” in Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademark is the Chinese transliteration of “KLOOK”. Thus, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name does not only consist of Complainant’s “KLOOK” trademark, but is also an obvious English transliteration of “客路”. It has been held in the past that a domain name that consists or is comprised of a translation or transliteration of a trademark would normally be found to be identical or confusingly similar to such trademark for purposes of standing under the Policy. See Compagnie Générale Des Etablissements Michelin – Michelin & Cie v. Graeme Foster, D2004-0279 (WIPO May 25, 2004).

Based on these submissions, it is the Complainant’s case that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademark, in which the Complainant has rights in Hong Kong; and thus, the Complainant has satisfied the onus of proof in accordance with Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(ii) The Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant submits as follows:

(a) The granting of registrations of the Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademarks by the Intellectual Property Department in Hong Kong and the registrations of the Complainant’s “KLOOK” trademarks by the Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), World Intellectual Property Office (WIPO) and the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is prima facie evidence of the validity of the term “klook” and “klook 客路” as trademarks in which the Complainant has exclusive rights to use in connection with the goods and/or services under the classes registered by these trademarks.

(b) The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted Respondent to register domain names incorporating Complainant’s trademarks.

(c) The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests. The name of the Respondent does not resemble the Disputed Domain Name in any manner. Thus, the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name within the meaning of Paragraph 4(d)(ii) of the Policy.

(d) The Disputed Domain Name currently resolves to a for sale page at <dan.com>, a domain brokerage site, where the Respondent has made the Disputed Domain Name available for sale as can be seen from a screenshot of
the Disputed Domain Name’s website at Annex 3 to the Complaint. Using the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent that trades upon the goodwill of Complainant for commercial gain neither evinces a bona fide offering of goods or services as allowed under Paragraph 4(d)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use as allowed under Paragraph 4(d)(iv) of the Policy.

(e) The Disputed Domain Name was registered on 31 May 2019 after the registrations of the Complainant’s “KLOOK” and “KLOOK 客路” trademarks; and also after Complainant’s acquisition of its domain name <klook.com> and registration of its other domain name <klook.com.hk> in 2015.

Based on these submissions, it is the Complainant’s case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name in accordance with Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(iii) Registrant’s Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant says that the Complainant and its “KLOOK” and “KLOOK 客路” trademarks are known internationally; and the Complainant has marketed extensively and provided its services using these trademarks since 2014, well before the Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Name in 2019.

The Complainant submits that by registering a domain name that incorporates Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademark in its entirety, the Respondent has created a domain name that is identical to Complainant’s trademark, as well as its <klook.com> and <klook.com.hk> domain names. As such, the Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant’s brands and business. Further, the composition of the domain makes it illogical to believe that Respondent registered the domain without specifically targeting Complainant. Based on the facts in this Complaint, it is “not possible to conceive of a plausible situation in which the Respondent would have been unaware of” the Complainant’s brands at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered. It is likely to mislead users into believing that the Disputed Domain Name and its website are affiliated with Complainant. See Telstra Corp. Ltd. v. Nuclear Marshmallows, D2000-0003 (WIPO Feb. 18, 2000). The Complainant also submits that the Complainant’s “KLOOK” and “KLOOK 客路” trademarks are so closely linked and associated with Complainant that the use of these marks by the Respondent’s use of these marks strongly implies bad faith. Where a domain name is “so obviously connected with such a well-known name and products; its very use by someone with no connection with the products suggests opportunistic bad faith.” See Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas, D2000-0226 (WIPO May 17, 2000). The Complainant adds that the, Complainant is a leading travel activities and services booking platform; and performing searches across a number of internet search engines for “klook” returns multiple links referencing
Complainant and its business as shown in the internet search results on Annex 11 to the Complaint.

The Complainant submits that as can been seen from a screenshot of the Disputed Domain Name’s website the Respondent at Annex 3 to the Complaint, the Respondent has created a likelihood of confusion between the Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademark and the Disputed Domain Name, leading to misperceptions as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Disputed Domain Name. In addition, the Respondent has demonstrated a nefarious intent to capitalize on the fame and goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark for Respondent’s own pecuniary gain. Such use of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent evinces a finding of bad faith under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.0 at paragraph 3.1.4.

The Complainant reiterates that the Respondent is currently offering to sell the Disputed Domain Name, which constitutes bad faith under Paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy because Respondent has demonstrated an intent to sell, rent, or otherwise transfer the Disputed Domain Name for valuable consideration in excess of his out-of-pocket expenses. The Complainant submits that it is well established that seeking to profit from the sale of a confusingly similar domain name that incorporates a third party’s trademark demonstrates bad faith. See Groupe Auchan v. Bui Tan Dat / Domain ID Shield Service Co., Limited, D2014-1935 (WIPO, Jan. 4, 2015); and Salvatore Ferragamo S.p.A. v. Duan Zuochun, DHK-1200085 (HKIAC Feb. 27, 2013).

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name can only be taken as intending to cause confusion among internet users as to the source of the Disputed Domain Name, and thus, the Disputed Domain Name must be considered as having been registered and used in bad faith pursuant to Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy; and thus any use of the Disputed Domain Name for an actual website in the present case could only be in bad faith. See Salvatore Ferragamo S.p.A. v. Duan Zuochun, DHK-1200086 (HKIAC Feb. 18, 2013).

The Complainant avers that there is evidence that the Respondent has engaged in a bad faith pattern of “cybersquatting” as the Respondent was involved in the past in the cases cited below, which show the pattern of cybersquatting in which Respondent is engaging:

- Salvatore Ferragamo S.p.A. v. Duan Zuochun, DHK-1200085 (HKIAC Feb. 27, 2013)
- Salvatore Ferragamo S.p.A. v. Duan Zuochun, DHK-1200086 (HKIAC Feb. 18, 2013)
- 芬纳机械股份公司（FINMECCANICA SOCIETA PER AZIONI）v. 段佐春, CND-2013000046 (CIETEC Oct. 23, 2013)
- BOURSORAMA S.A. v. ZuoChun Duan, D00014012 (DRS May 13, 2014)
- EUROSPORT v. DUAN ZuoChun, D00021498 (DRS Jul. 25, 2019)
The Complaint adds that the Respondent currently holds the registrations for other domain names that could have misappropriated the trademarks of certain well-known brands and businesses as shown by the Whois data exhibited on Annex 12 to the Complaint. The Complainant submits that this additional information demonstrates that the Respondent is engaging in a pattern of cybersquatting/typosquatting, which is evidence of bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name. See BHP Billiton Innovation Pty Ltd v. Cameron David Jackson / PrivacyDotLink Customer 2415391 / PrivacyDotLink Customer 2463008, D2016-2020 (WIPO, Nov. 21, 2016); and Alibaba Group Holding Limited v. ALEXANDER CHEN, DHK-1700150 (HKIAC Dec. 7, 2017).

It is therefore the Complainant’s contention that the Respondent clearly knew of and targeted Complainant’s trademarks for the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. See Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc., D2014-1754 (WIPO Jan 12, 2014)

For the reasons set out above, it is the Complainant’s case that the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith in accordance with Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based upon all the above submissions, the Complainant asks that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. The Respondent

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

5. Discussion and Findings by the Arbitration Panel

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving that:

(i) the Disputed Domain is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in Hong Kong in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain; and

(iii) the Disputed Domain has been registered and is being used in bad faith; and
(iv) if the Disputed Domain Name is registered by an individual person, the Registrant does not meet the registration requirements for that individual category of Domain Name.

The Arbitration Panel will make its findings in the paragraphs below.

(1) **Identical/confusing similarity**

The first question that arises for determination is whether the Complainant has a trademark or service mark in Hong Kong on which it can rely.

Based on the documentary evidence in Annex 1 to the Complaint, the Arbitration Panel finds that the Complaint is the registered owner of the following “KLOOK 客路” trademarks registered in Hong Kong:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration No.</th>
<th>Trade Mark</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Date of Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303474108</td>
<td>KLOOK 客路</td>
<td>35, 38, 39, 42</td>
<td>07-16-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304442247</td>
<td>KLOOK 客路</td>
<td>9, 41</td>
<td>02-26-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question that arises for determination is whether the Disputed Domain Name may be said to be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademarks that the Complainant has rights in Hong Kong. Obviously, the Disputed Domain Name contains the entire English word “KLOOK” of the Complainant’s trademarks as its only distinctive component, and it is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered “KLOOK 客路” trademarks in Hong Kong. Whether or not “客路” in Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademarks is the Chinese transliteration of “KLOOK” is immaterial to this finding of confusing similarity between the Complainant’s mark as “KLOOK 客路” and the Dispute Domain Name <klook.hk>. “KLOOK” is a probably an invented word and is prominently a distinctive component of Complainant’s “KLOOK 客路” trademarks. It is well established that the suffix “.hk” can be ignored in making this determination. The Arbitration Panel therefore finds that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s registered Hong Kong trademarks “KLOOK 客路” of which the Complainant has rights.
Based on the above findings, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(2) Rights or Legitimate Interests of Respondent

As stated in paragraph 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, once a complainant establishes a prima facie case in respect of the lack of rights or legitimate interests of a respondent, the respondent then carries the burden of demonstrating that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Where the respondent fails to do so, a complainant is deemed to have satisfied Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Based on the statements and documents submitted with the Complaint, the Arbitration Panel finds that a prima facie case has been made out by the Complainant that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Paragraph 4(d) of the Policy provides as follows:

“Any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by an Arbitration Panel to be proven based on its evaluation of all evidence presented to it, shall demonstrate the Registrant’s rights or legitimate interests to the Domain Name for purposes of Paragraph 4(a)(ii):

(i) before any notice to the Registrant of the dispute, the Registrant’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in Hong Kong; or

(ii) the Registrant (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if the Registrant has acquired no trade mark or service mark rights in Hong Kong; or

(iii) the Registrant has trademark or service mark rights that the mark is identical to the Domain Name the Registrant is holding; or

(iv) the Registrant is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trade mark or service mark at issue; or

(v) If the Domain Name is registered in one of the Individual Domain Name Categories, the Domain Name registered must be the Registrant’s own “individual name”, which can be either (1) the Registrant’s legal name, or (2) a name by which the Registrant is commonly known and can include, for example, a pseudonym the Registrant uses if the Registrant is an author or a painter, or a stage name if the Registrant is a singer or actor,
or the name of a fictional character if the Registrant has created or can otherwise show it has rights in such fictional character.”

The Respondent has not responded to the Complaint.

Having considered all the evidence presented, and the statements made in the submissions by the Complainant, the Arbitration Panel finds none of the circumstances in paragraph 4(d) existed. As such, the Arbitration Panel concludes that the prima facie case that the Respondent lacks any rights and legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name has not been rebutted.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(3) **Bad Faith**

In order to establish bad faith for the purposes of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith and has been used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides:

“For the purposes of Paragraph 4(a)(iii), the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by an Arbitration Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a Domain Name in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the Registrant has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark, or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Registrant’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or

(ii) the Registrant has registered the 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 the Registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) the Registrant has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Domain Name, the Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Registrant’s web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or
endorsement of the Registrant’s web site or location or of a product or service on the Registrant’s web site or location.”

However, these criteria are not exclusive and the Complainant may also rely on conduct that is bad faith within the generally accepted meaning of that expression.

Having regard to all the relevant circumstances and documentary evidence in the present case and after taking into consideration the aforesaid principles, the Arbitration Panel accepts the Complainant’s submission and finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and had been used in bad faith for the following reasons.

(a) The Complainant has registered and used the “KLOOK 客路” trademarks in Hong Kong since 2015 before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent in 2019. On the evidence presented, the Arbitration Panel is satisfied that the Complainant’s “Klook” booking platform for travel activities and related services is well-known worldwide. It could not be a sheer coincidence that the Respondent had chosen the word “Klook” for the registration of the Disputed Domain Name without any knowledge of “KLOOK 客路” and “KLOOK” trademarks. On a totality of all the relevant evidence and circumstances of the present case, it can be irresistibly inferred that by taking the Complainant’s well-known “klook” mark for registration of the Disputed Domain Name, it is bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent.

(b) Annex 3 to the Complaint clearly shows that the Disputed Domain Name is offered for sale. The Panel accepts the Complainant’s submission that an outright offer of a domain that incorporates another’s well-known mark for sale can establish a finding that the domain was registered and being used in bad faith. This Annex 3 also shows that there was no active use by the Respondent of the Disputed Domain Name. It has generally been accepted that the apparent lack of active use of the domain name (passive holding) does not prevent a finding of bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.0, paragraph 3.2.

(c) It is obvious from the evidence submitted in the Complaint that the Respondent was engaging in the conduct of cybersquatting and that establishes presumptive bad faith on the part of Respondent in registering and using the Disputed Domain Name.

Based on the above reasons, the Arbitration Panel finds that that Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) and (ii); and within the generally accepted meaning of bad faith registration and use of a domain name.
Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

(4) **Registration requirements for that individual category of domain name**

As the Disputed Domain Name is not a 個人.hk domain name as referred to in Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(iv) of the Policy is therefore not applicable.

For all the reasons aforesaid, the Arbitration Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied all the requirements under Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

(5) **Eligibility Requirements under the Registration Policies**

In addition to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Arbitration Panel has also considered the eligibility requirements under paragraph 3 of the Domain Name Registration Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for .hk and 香港 domain names (the “Registration Policies”) issued by HKIRC effective from 22 February 2011.

The Disputed Domain Name <klook.hk> is a second level domain name, under paragraph 3.4 of the Registration Policies it is registrable by “all interested … entities” irrespective of the place of incorporation or registration of such entity as provided, for instance, in paragraph 3.6 of the Registration Policies. On the evidence presented, the Complainant is a Hong Kong incorporated company.

On this basis, the Arbitration Panel considers that prima facie, the Complainant meets the eligibility requirements under the Registration Policies as a registrant of the Disputed Domain Name if an award is made in its favour in these proceedings.

6. **AWARD**

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(a) of the Policy and Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Arbitration Panel AWARDS, ORDERS AND DIRECTS that Disputed Domain Name <klook.hk> be transferred to the Complainant.
Date of Issue: 18 December 2019

Place of arbitration: Hong Kong SAR

_______________________________
Raymond HO
Sole Panelist of the Arbitral Tribunal