

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

InnerSloth LLC v. jackzou1234 1234, Easy Click Limited
Case No. D2026-3470

1. The Parties

Complainant is InnerSloth LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

Respondent is jackzou1234 1234, Easy Click Limited, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amogusonline.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 5, 2026. On August 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 6, 2026, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 7, 2026, 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 August 7, 2026.

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 August 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 30, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeffrey M. Samuels as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 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

Founded in 2015, Complainant is a renowned independent game development studio based in the United States. The Complainant contends its best-known game is called “Among Us”, which has become a defining title in the online gaming industry. Among Us has been downloaded hundreds of millions of times on all major platforms. In 2020, the game had already reached 300 million monthly active users.

Complainant owns several registrations for the AMONG US trademark. These are European Union Trade Mark No. 018384304 (registration date June 24, 2021); European Union Trade Mark No. 018384099 (stylized version of mark; registration date June 24, 2021); and United States Registration No. 6891716 (registration date November 8, 2022).

The disputed domain name was registered on October 21, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that shows the AMONG US trademark and where users can play Complainant’s AMONG US videogame and third-party games for free.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the AMONG US trademark. Complainant points out that the disputed domain name incorporates a misspelled version of the AMONG US mark, namely the elimination of the letter “n”, along with the additional term “online”.

Complainant alleges that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant asserts that it has not licensed or authorized Respondent to use the AMONG US mark, nor a misspelled variation thereof; that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant; and Complainant has not endorsed or sponsored Respondent.

Complainant further argues that there is no evidence that Respondent is known by the disputed domain name. Complainant’s search for Respondent’s name or for Respondent’s organization name revealed no results showing a connection between Respondent and the disputed domain name.

Complainant maintains that use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Complainant points out that the disputed domain name resolves to a website showing the AMONG US trademark in a prominent position and where the AMONG US videogame offered by Complainant is playable for free.

Referring to the Privacy Policy section of the disputed website, which indicates that information collected through use of such site may be used for advertising purposes, Complainant maintains that such use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain.

With respect to the issue of bad faith registration and use, Complainant notes that the disputed domain name was registered well after registration of the AMONG US marks and that the AMONG US videogame has proven extremely popular and enjoyed “extraordinary” commercial success. That being the case, Complainant asserts that “[i]t is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant when it registered the Disputed Domain Name”.

Complainant also points to earlier UDRP panel decisions that hold that typosquatting is evidence of bad faith registration.

Complainant indicates that the structure of the disputed domain name – incorporating a misspelled version of the AMONG US mark, along with the relevant term “online” – “reflects the Respondent’s intention to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, with the Complainant and its AMONG US trademark in Internet users’ minds”. Complainant reiterates that the disputed domain name resolves to a website showing prominent use of the AMONG US mark and where Complainant’s videogame is playable for free.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark, even as misspelled, is recognizable within the disputed domain name. As set forth in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9, “[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”.

Although the addition of other terms, here the term “online”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such descriptive term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established that none of the circumstances set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy is applicable and, thus, has made out 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 registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such site and of the goods/services offered at such site, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. As determined above, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's mark, and the case file establishes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that features Complainant's AMONG US mark and videogame along with competing games. The fact that the games are purportedly playable for free does not preclude a finding that Respondent's use of the disputed domain name was for commercial gain where, as here, Respondent offers competing videogames and, as alluded by its Privacy Policy, earns revenue from the transmittal of information regarding the advertisements viewed by users of its website.

Moreover, as Complainant asserts, previous UDRP panels have held that typosquatting is itself evidence of bad faith registration. See, e.g., *Solvay SA v. Broskin Mansaga, Cloushd Sidnasta B. Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2022-0102](#). That Respondent engaged in typosquatting supports a determination that Respondent was aware of Complainant and of its AMONG US mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and specifically targeted Complainant and its mark at the time of registration. Given the fact that Respondent engaged in typosquatting and the commercial success enjoyed by Complainant's AMONG US videogame, as Complainant alleges, it is "inconceivable" that Respondent was not aware of the existence of Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name. The inclusion of the term "online" in the disputed domain name further supports a finding of the requisite bad faith since Complainant's videogame is offered online.

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 <amogusonline.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey M. Samuels/

Jeffrey M. Samuels

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026