

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ShinStar LLC v. Paramvir Singh

Case No. D2026-1095

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ShinStar LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Paramvir Singh, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <sprunkimods.com>, <sprunkin.com>, and <sprunkiplay.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 13, 2026. The Complaint originally included the domain name <sprunki.org> in addition to the three disputed domain names to which the proceeding continues to relate. On March 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. That response included registrant and contact information for <sprunki.org> which differed from that relating to the three remaining disputed domain names. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 17, 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 20, 2026, in which the <sprunki.org> was no longer included.

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 March 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph

5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on March 29, 2026. On April 17, 2026, the Complainant filed a supplemental filing. On the same date, the Respondent requested an opportunity to submit a supplemental filing in the event that the Complainant's supplemental filing was accepted.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 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.

The Panel has determined, in its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, to admit the Complainant's supplemental filing, as further discussed below. In view of the Panel's overall findings, no supplemental filing from the Respondent is necessary.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a corporation registered in Colorado, United States. It is the operator of a website at "www.sprunki.com", which offers a free-to-play music creation game, referred to as "Sprunki Game".

While the Parties have provided limited background information concerning the "Sprunki" phenomenon, the Panel has determined from both the available evidence and from publicly available sources¹ that:

- a website at "www.incredibox.com" enables users to create "beatbox" style music by dragging and dropping icons onto a variety of animated characters;
- the original Incredibox game spawned a variety of user-created, unofficial modifications ("mods") that introduced new sounds, visuals, and characters;
- one such user-created mod was "Sprunki", which was created by a user "NyankoBfLol", using the "Scratch" content creation application, on or around August 24, 2024;
- the "Sprunki" mod features colourful characters, where placing hats or other items on those characters triggers sounds and animations, involving a horror-styled theme in particular.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations for the trademark SPRUNKI in various jurisdictions. The earliest such registration appears to be Australia trademark registration number 2533304 for the word mark SPRUNKI, registered on March 24, 2025. The Complainant's other registrations include, for example:

- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00004147997 for the word mark SPRUNKI, registered on April 4, 2025, with an application date of January 15, 2025;
- European Union trademark registration number 019131411 for the word mark SPRUNKI, registered on April 30, 2025, with an application date of January 15, 2025; and
- United States trademark registration number 7913577 for the word mark SPRUNKI, registered on August 26, 2025, with a filing date of October 16, 2024.

The Complainant's United States registration records the date of first use of the mark in commerce as September 19, 2024.

¹ As stated in section 4.8 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.

The Complainant's website at "www.sprunki.com" includes various games based on a variety of "Sprunki" characters, and states:

"Sprunki: A Fan-Made Music Game - Sprunki is a creative and engaging music game - a fan-made mod that brings the fun of beat-making to life through free online gameplay. Play Sprunki Online to craft your own unique beats inspired by classic beat-making experiences. Mix distinctive sounds, unlock the horror-themed Sprunki Phase series, and immerse yourself in endless music-mixing fun!"

The Complainant's website further states:

"Disclaimer: Sprunki.com is an independent platform providing Sprunki mods and is not affiliated with the original game developers."

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

- <sprunkin.com> on October 17, 2024
- <sprunkimods.com> on October 20, 2024
- <sprunkiplay.com> on October 26, 2024

The Complainant provides evidence of the following use of each of the disputed domain names as of March 13, 2026:

- The disputed domain name <sprunkin.com> resolved to a website headed "Sprunkin" and offering "Sprunki Game". The website promoted a wide variety of "new games", all based on the "Sprunki" title. The website included the following statement: "Creator of Original Sprunki Mod – Creator: NyankoBfLol – Age: 15 years old from Thailand", together with further information about this individual. It also stated: "Unlike the original Incredibox, Sprunki Game introduces Sprunki mods and Sprunki phases, which add fresh challenges, custom visuals, and new soundtracks", and: "Sprunki is NOT an official Incredibox update - it's a fan universe created by passionate modders, artists, and music creators."

- The disputed domain name <sprunkimods.com> resolved to a website headed "Trending Sprunki Mods" and also appeared to offer a variety of "Sprunki" themed games. The website stated: "Sprunki Incredibox Mods - Play HD Sprunki Games Online - Sprunki Incredibox has captured the imagination of music lovers and gamers alike, combining the creative freedom of music-making with interactive gameplay. This fan-made series, based on the Incredibox game, has quickly become a favorite among players who enjoy experimenting with beats, melodies, and rhythm loops". It also stated: "What Is Sprunki Incredibox? Sprunki Incredibox is a fan-made modification of the original Incredibox game. For those unfamiliar, Incredibox is an interactive music game where players create layered tracks by dragging and dropping animated characters, each representing a different sound element (beat, vocal, melody, etc.). Sprunki mods build on this concept, adding new characters, visuals, sound effects, and gameplay features, making each version unique and exciting".

- The disputed domain name <sprunkiplay.com> resolved to a website headed "Sprunki Play" and again offered a variety of games based on the "Sprunki" name. It stated: "Sprunki Game: Play Incredibox Sprunki Games Online - The Sprunki Game is a fan-driven modding phenomenon based on the popular music creation game Incredibox. It allows players to explore new ways of creating music through innovative mods that introduce custom characters, beats, visuals, and storylines. With its vibrant community and endless creativity, the Sprunki universe has become a haven for music enthusiasts and casual gamers alike".

The Complainant also provides evidence that, as of March 19, 2026, the disputed domain names <sprunkin.com> and <sprunkiplay.com> no longer resolved to any active websites.

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.

The Complainant submits that each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to its SPRUNKI trademark. It states that each disputed domain name includes the entirety of that trademark, which is generally sufficient to satisfy the first element under the policy. It contends that the additional terms "mods" and "play" in two of the disputed domain names are descriptive words, and that neither those terms, nor the additional letter "n" in the third disputed domain name, prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain names.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. It states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has never authorized it to use its SPRUNKI trademark, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by the disputed domain names, and that the Respondent is making neither bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that, instead, the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to offer identical services to those provided by the Complainant, and is misleadingly diverting consumers and/or tarnishing the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain, which it obtains by way of advertisements included on its websites.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. It states that the disputed domain names are so obviously connected with the Complainant's SPRUNKI trademark as to raise an inference of "opportunistic bad faith", and that the Respondent's clear intent is to disrupt the Complainant's relationship with its customers and to divert those customers to its own websites. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's offer of nearly identical versions of the Complainant's games reinforces the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant submits that the registration dates of its trademarks are immaterial to the question of bad faith, since the Respondent registered each of the disputed domain names between 28 and 37 days after the Complainant began to use the SPRUNKI mark in commerce and its registration of the <sprunki.com> domain name. It argues, therefore, that it was the Respondent's clear intent to capitalize upon its nascent trademark rights, which is sufficient to give rise to a finding of bad faith (see e.g., section 3.8.2 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)).

The Complainant exhibits evidence of its use of the SPRUNKI mark prior to the date of registration of the disputed domain names. It provides, for example, archived web pages from "www.sprunki.com" dated September 23, 2024, which is headed "Welcome to the World of Sprunki Incredibox", and offers immediate access to games.

The web pages exhibited by the Complainant also include the following statements:

"About - Sprunki is a horror Incredibox mod by NyankoBfLol that allows players to place a variety of hats on a row of characters, each hat transforming the character and causing them to sing specific melodies or make specific sounds...."

"History - On August 24th, 2024, the Sprunki Incredibox mod was released by Cocrea user NyankoBfLol, however, the page no longer seems to be active. The game has since been reuploaded to several sites, including sprunki.org."

"Sprunki Incredibox can be played online on its official website and other gaming platforms that host the game."

The Complainant submits that the Respondent's registration of a total of three domain names incorporating its SPRUNKI mark is further evidence of its bad faith, as is the fact that it ceased to use two of the disputed domain names for the purpose of offending websites after the Complaint in this proceeding was filed.

The Complainant adds that the Respondent has already been the subject of a prior adverse finding under the UDRP, i.e., *JanitorAI Inc. v. Paramvir Singh, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1529](#).

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

The Respondent denies that the Complainant has established the necessary elements for a transfer of the disputed domain names under the Policy. He asserts, in particular, that the disputed domain names were registered in the context of a fast-moving viral online fan phenomenon surrounding the "Sprunki" concept, which was widely known as a fan-made Incredibox mod associated with creator NyankoBfLol, and not as a designation uniquely identifying the Complainant.

The Respondent submits that neither the registration or filing dates of the Complainant's (now) registered trademarks established either that the name "Sprunki" was uniquely associated with the Complainant, or that the Respondent sought to target the Complainant, at the date the disputed domain names were registered. He adds that the disclaimer included on the Complainant's own website significantly undercuts its claim that it was the original source of the "Sprunki" name.

The Respondent contends that the Complainant's first use date of the SPRUNKI trademark, namely September 19, 2024, does not equate to that mark having acquired exclusive source significance as an identifier of the Complainant as of that date.

The Respondent submits that there were multiple users and website which made use of the "Sprunki" name at or around the time he registered the disputed domain names, and that he had a legitimate basis to use the name in a nominative or descriptive sense. He exhibits a list of websites and dates (although these are not specifically referenced in the Response), including for example:

"www.sprunkigame.org" (October 7, 2024)
"www.sprunky.org" (October 13, 2024)
"www.sprunkigo.com" (November 6, 2024)
"www.sprunkionline.io" (December 3, 2024)
"www.sprunkies.com" (December 16, 2024)

The Panel notes that each of these websites appears to offer games in a similar manner to the Complainant and the Respondent, and that none of them has any immediately apparent connection with the Complainant.

The Respondent submits that the "Sprunki" name was part of a broader fan ecosystem at the relevant time, making it harder to establish that any particular website operator had been targeted.

The Respondent states that he has never claimed to be the Complainant or the official trademark owner, and that he did not register the disputed domain names solely for resale to the Complainant.

The Respondent contends that the Complainant's original Complaint was overbroad, incorrectly having included the <sprunki.org> domain name.

C. Complainant's Supplemental Filing

Unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged in proceedings under the UDRP, save in exceptional circumstances. In this instance, the Complainant seeks to address the Respondent's

contentions which it submits it did not know, and could not have anticipated, at the time it filed the Complaint. While the Panel does not wholly accept this premise, it determines nonetheless to admit the Complainant's supplemental filing.

The principal thrust of the Complainant's supplemental filing is that there is no requirement under the UDRP for a respondent to target a specific complainant, as it is the targeting of the trademark itself that is crucial to the element of bad faith. The Complainant cites the references in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy to creating confusion with "the Complainant's mark", and in section 3.1 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) to conduct "detrimental to the complainant's trademark". It also cites *Edward Don & Company v. Black Bayou LLC / Domain Administrator*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1373](#), as authority for the proposition that: "the respondent must have actual knowledge of the mark in question, and have actively targeted that mark in order to benefit from the mark's value".

The Complainant adds that, in view of the wide range of goods and services for which its various trademarks are registered, the Respondent's references to a broader community ecosystem, or fan-created online phenomenon, are irrelevant.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark SPRUNKI. It is immaterial for the purpose of the first element under the Policy (although potentially relevant to the second and third elements) that all of the Complainant's trademark registrations post-date the date of registration of the disputed domain names.

Each of the disputed domain names incorporates the SPRUNKI trademark in full, together with, respectively, the letter "n", the term "mods", and the term "play". None of these additions prevents the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain names, and the Panel therefore finds that each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The first element under the Policy is therefore satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In the light of the Panel's findings in respect of the third element under the Policy, below, the Panel does not find it necessary to reach a determination upon the second element in this case.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In order to satisfy the third element under the Policy, the Complainant must establish the conjunctive requirement that the Respondent both registered, and has used, the disputed domain names in bad faith. In order to demonstrate registration in bad faith, the Complainant must prove, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the date he registered the disputed domain names, and that he did so in order to take unfair advantage of (or cause unfair detriment to) that trademark.

The Panel finds, on the evidence, that the Complainant was not the originator of the coined term "Sprunki", and that that term was already the subject of substantial fan-based or community use by the date of the Complainant's claimed first use of that term, namely September 19, 2024. Indeed, it does not appear to be in dispute that the "Sprunki" mod was created by user NyankoBfLol in conjunction with the existing Incredibox platform game, and the Complainant candidly admits these matters in the "About" and "History" sections of the website pages it has exhibited. It also states that its website is: "an independent platform providing Sprunki mods and is not affiliated with the original game developers".

It is therefore relevant to consider in what circumstances the Complainant obtained its SPRUNKI trademark registrations. The Panel notes in this regard the Complainant's statement, dating from September 23, 2024 that:

"On August 24th, 2024, the Sprunki Incredibox mod was released by Cocrea user NyankoBfLol, however, the page no longer seems to be active. The game has since been reuploaded to several sites, including sprunki.org."

It therefore seems to the Panel that the Complainant's application for SPRUNKI trademarks in various jurisdictions sought to take advantage of a possibly "orphaned" pre-existing mark, rather than building upon a name and/or concept invented by the Complainant itself. While the Panel does not comment on a commercial strategy of this nature, it is nevertheless material to the bad faith, or otherwise, of other contemporaneous users of the "Sprunki" name.

The Complainant is right to say that it is the targeting of the trademark itself, and not its particular owner, that is the relevant consideration under the Policy. Indeed, it is not uncommon for the ownership of a well-known trademark to change, without materially affecting the reputation and profile of the mark in question or the commercial goodwill attaching to it. However, in the view of the Panel, regardless of the identity of its owner, the mark must still function in a "trademark sense", in other words, as an indication of the origin of the goods or services in question, to the exclusion of other parties.

It is clear in this case that, so far as the registration of the disputed domain names is concerned, the Complainant cannot rely on its various trademark registrations, all of which are dated after the dates on which the disputed domain names were registered. The Complainant could, potentially, rely on its activities prior to the trademark registration dates as already having establishing unregistered or common law trademark rights, but this would require the Complainant to demonstrate that, at the date in question, the trademark had gained significance as a distinctive identifier of its goods or services, to the exclusion of other parties. The Panel does not find that to have been established in this case.

First, the Respondent is right to contend that the date of the Complainant's first use of the SPRUNKI trademark, namely September 19, 2024, does not equate to it having gained unregistered or common law trademark status by that date. While the Complainant would no doubt argue that the Respondent could or should) have been aware of the Complainant's use of the mark from that date, or from the dates of its various trademark filings, it does not appear to the Panel that even such awareness would establish the Respondent's bad faith unless the mark had by then become an exclusive identifier of the Complainant, which the Panel does not find to have been the case.

The Complainant provides evidence that it registered the domain name <sprunki.com> on September 19, 2024 and operated a website at “www.sprunki.com” from on or about that date. However, these matters do not of themselves establish either public awareness of the Complainant’s use of the mark from that date, or any public perception associating the mark exclusively with the Complainant. Indeed, a Google search against the term “Sprunki” time-limited to October 17, 2024 (the registration date of the first of the disputed domain names) returns results including a number of YouTube videos and “Sprunki” game offerings, although none that appear to relate to the Complainant. Furthermore, as set out above, the Respondent has produced evidence of a significant number of other websites offering “Sprunki” games before or shortly after the dates the disputed domain names were registered, none of which appear to be related to the Complainant.

While the Complainant is right, therefore, that the relevant consideration is the trademark itself and not the identity of the owner, that does not detract from the necessity of the trademark to have become associated with *some* exclusive source or origin, whatever the identity of that source or origin may be. The Panel does not find that to be the case as at the date the disputed domain names were registered. The Panel finds that the term “Sprunki” was in commercial use, in relation to the same Incredibox-derived game, by a variety of different parties at the date the disputed domain names were registered; and therefore, even if the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s “www.sprunki.com” website, or indeed its trademark applications, that does not mean that the Respondent targeted either the Complainant or its (nascent) SPRUNKI trademark. This is an essential element of bad faith under the Policy, and the Panel does not find it to be present given the established and broad use of the “Sprunki” name by a variety of parties to refer to similar games at the material time.

The Panel notes that the registration of the first of the disputed domain names, i.e., October 17, 2024 took place one day after the filing date of the Complainant’s United States trademark referred to above. The panel also accepts the Complainant’s submission that a respondent may target nascent trademark rights in bad faith, even before a corresponding registration has been confirmed. Such cases may typically involve a respondent anticipating the announcement or launch of a particular brand: however, those cases require once again that the complainant is able to establish a sufficient level of exclusivity in the relevant mark at the date the disputed domain name was registered, which is not the case in this instance.

Noting once again that the Complainant has obtained trademark registrations for the SPRUNKI mark in various jurisdictions, it is of course open to the Complainant to bring proceedings before the relevant national courts if it believes the Respondent’s activities infringe its trademark rights. However, the considerations under the UDRP are not necessarily the same as those applicable to trademark litigation. The Complainant has failed to establish in this case that, at the date the disputed domain names were registered, the Complainant had any (existing or nascent) rights in the mark SPRUNKI of which the Respondent sought to take unfair advantage, as opposed to the Respondent participating in a phenomenon around the “Sprunki” concept in common with numerous other parties.

While noting that the Respondent has been the subject of one prior adverse finding under the UDRP, the Panel does consider this factor to be material to its analysis of the bad faith element as above. The Panel takes a similar view of the Respondent having ceased to operate websites in connection with two of the disputed domain names after the Complaint was filed.

The Complainant has failed in the circumstances to establish the third element under the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

While the Panel finds the Complaint in this case to have been speculative, it does not consider that the Complaint was brought in bad faith. The Complainant has been successful in obtaining SPRUNKI trademarks, and there is a coincidence between the filing date of its United States application and the registration dates of the disputed domain names, even though the Complainant has been unable to establish unfairness, and therefore bad faith, on the Respondent's part. The prior adverse finding against the Respondent is also a relevant factor. While the Complainant's original Complaint may have been overbroad in including the <sprunki.org> domain name, this factor does not materially alter the Panel's findings in this regard.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: May 7, 2026