

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

InnerSloth LLC v. ceremoy monetirized
Case No. D2026-3636

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is ceremoy monetirized, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <freeamongus.online> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 13, 2026. On August 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 17, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 August 18, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 game development studio incorporated in the United States. Founded in 2015, the Complainant is the creator of Among Us, a multiplayer social deduction game released in 2018 that achieved substantial commercial success across global gaming audiences. The game features an astronaut-shaped character known as the “Crewmate”, around which a crew of up to ten players must complete tasks aboard a spaceship while identifying an impostor whose objective is to eliminate the other players. Among Us has been downloaded hundreds of millions of times across mobile, PC, and console platforms, reaching 300 million monthly active users and 60 million daily active players by late 2020, with over 300 million downloads in that year alone. The Complainant has received numerous industry accolades in connection with the game, including The Game Awards for Best Multiplayer Game and Best Mobile Game in 2020.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for the word mark AMONG US and associated figurative marks (hereinafter, the “AMONG US Mark”) in numerous jurisdictions worldwide. The following registrations are representative:

- (i) United States trademark registration No. 6891716 (Serial No. 90273152) for the word mark AMONG US, registered on November 8, 2022, covering video games and related entertainment services;
- (ii) European Union trade mark registration No. 018384304 for the word mark AMONG US, registered on June 24, 2021;
- (iii) European Union trade mark registration No. 018384099 for the figurative AMONG US mark, registered on June 24, 2021; and
- (iv) Chinese trademark registration No. 55452011 for the figurative AMONG US mark, registered on December 21, 2022.

The disputed domain name <freeamongus.online> was registered on June 23, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to an active website that reproduces the AMONG US Mark and displays unauthorized characters substantially similar to the Complainant’s Crewmate design. The website purports to offer an unauthorized, playable version or imitation of the Complainant’s video game, including references to the official game’s rules, maps, and other elements. Notably, when users attempt to access the advertised free version of the game, they are directed to a registration page under the disputed domain name — presented in the Indonesian language — where they are invited to complete an “Account Registration” form requiring sensitive personal information, including username, password, email address, telephone number, and bank account details.

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 name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 the 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.

The 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms like "free" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 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.

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

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves leaves no doubt that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its AMONG US Mark at the time of registration. The website reproduces the AMONG US Mark and displays unauthorized characters substantially similar to the Complainant's Crewmate design, while purporting to offer a playable version of the Complainant's video game and making explicit references to the official game's rules, maps, and other elements. Such unauthorized conduct demonstrates that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant's trademark and the goodwill associated therewith.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

Moreover, the Panel considers that the Respondent's conduct presents an aggravated dimension of bad faith. When users attempt to access the purported free version of the game advertised on the website, they are directed to a registration page under the disputed domain name — presented in the Indonesian language — where they are prompted to complete an account registration form requiring sensitive personal information, including username, password, email address, telephone number, and bank account details. The Panel finds that using a domain name to harvest personal and financial data from Internet users under the guise of a well-known video game brand — without any authorization from the trademark owner — constitutes a particularly serious form of bad faith use that falls squarely within the Panel's broad assessment of bad faith conduct under the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds that the 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 <freeamongus.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026