

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

InnerSloth LLC v. Artem Rutkovsky

Case No. D2026-3751

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Artem Rutkovsky, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amongusplay.online> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 21, 2026. On August 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 25, 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 (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) 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 31, 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 September 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Juan Lapenne as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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

The Complainant is a game development company founded in 2015 and based in the United States.

The Complainant is best known for creating Among Us, which is a globally popular multiplayer social deduction game. Among Us was released in 2018 and it has been downloaded hundreds of millions of times on all major platforms, such as mobile devices, PC and consoles.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks for AMONG US throughout the world such as:

United States trademark registration No. 6891716 for AMONG US, registered on November 8, 2022, in international class 41.

Chinese trademark registration No. 55452011 for AMONG US, registered on December 21, 2022, in international class 41.

European Union trademark registration No. 018384304 for AMONG US, registered on June 24, 2021, in international classes 9, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 35 and 41.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was created on December 4, 2020.

The disputed domain name resolves to an active website that displays the Complainant's AMONG US trademark and offers Internet users the opportunity to play an unauthorized version of the Complainant's Among Us video game. The website features characters that are substantially identical to those appearing in the Complainant's Among Us video game, as well as game rules that are substantially the same. The website serves advertisements to Internet users.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark AMONG US in which the Complainant has rights, as it entirely reproduces the AMONG US trademark.

The Complainant submits that the addition of the term "play" in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends the Among Us game had already achieved extraordinary commercial success by the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has never been licensed, authorized or permitted by the Complainant to use the trademark AMONG US.

The Complainant contends there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name nor owns any corresponding registered trademark.

The Complainant submits the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to resolve to an active website that reproduces the Complainant's AMONG US trademark; uses several unauthorized characters that are substantially the same as the Complainant's characters; offers an unauthorized and playable version/imitation of the Complainant's Among Us video game; and includes references to the official game and its game rules.

Therefore, the Complainant contends the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services and cannot give rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

With reference to circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant contends it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name, due to the following: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name two years after the release of the Among Us game; (ii) at a time when the game had already reached hundreds of millions of downloads and hundreds of millions of active users; and (iii) weeks after the filing of the Complainant's United States trademark application for AMONG US.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in the manner described above is indeed an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights over the trademark AMONG US based on the trademark registrations cited under Section 4 above.

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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the AMONG US trademark, as it entirely incorporates the AMONG US trademark with the mere addition of the term “play” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.online”. Indeed, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The applicable gTLD (here “.online”) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has established rights according to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

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.

In the instant case, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to incorporate its AMONG US trademark in the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent a licensee or otherwise affiliated to the Complainant.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that displays the Complainant’s trademark and offers Internet users the opportunity to play an unauthorized version of the Complainant’s Among Us video game. The website features characters that are substantially identical to those appearing in the Complainant’s Among Us video game, as well as game rules that are substantially the same.

In the absence of any authorization from the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is misleading Internet users, inducing them to believe that the Respondent’s website belongs to the Complainant or at least is sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant, hence the Respondent is unduly profiting from the goodwill of the Complainant’s well-known trademark.

The use of a domain name for impersonating/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.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant prove that the disputed domain name was registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith.

As to registration, the record contains evidence demonstrating that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name i) more than two years after the release of the Complainant's Among Us video game, ii) at a time when the game had already reached hundreds of millions of downloads and hundreds of millions of active users, iii) weeks after the filing of the Complainant's United States trademark application for AMONG US, and iv) after several articles had been published reporting the success of the Among Us video game.

The inclusion of the term "play" in the disputed domain name is another indicator that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its Among Us video game at the time of registration.

These circumstances suggest, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent knew the Complainant and its Among Us video game at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant's Among Us trademark and offering Internet users an unauthorized version of the Complainant's video game, featuring substantially the same characters and the same game rules.

Therefore, by using the disputed domain name in the manner described above, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <amongusplay.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Juan Lapenne/

Juan Lapenne

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2026