

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

So Far So Good v. He Echo and brave kieu
Case No. DIO2025-0042

1. The Parties

The Complainant is So Far So Good, France, represented Galia Partners, France.

The Respondents are He Echo, China and brave kieu, Yemen.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <incredibox-game.io> and <incrediboxsprunki.io> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain name <sprunki-incredibox.io> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 21, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 21 and 22, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses 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 / Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 23, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all the disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 28, 2025.

The Respondent He Echo sent emails to the Center on October 24, 25, and 29, 2025, expressing his willingness to explore settlement with the Complainant. On October 24, 2025, the Center indicated that the Complainant should submit a request for suspension of the proceeding, if the Parties wanted to explore settlement options.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 20, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any formal response. On November 24, 2025, the Center informed the Parties it would proceed with panel appointment.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on November 26, 2025. 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 French company founded in 2009 that specializes in online music games and interactive entertainment based on beatbox. The Complainant created and published a beatboxing-based music video game called “Incredibox”. The concept of the game is users dragging and dropping sound icons on different characters to make music.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for a trademark that includes the term “incredibox” in lower case letters, above which is a black and white image of a man’s face in cartoon format. An example is United States of America trademark registration number 4277757 that has a registration date of January 22, 2013.

Since 2007, the Complainant has operated a website at the domain name <incredibox.com> to promote and play Incredibox games.

The Complaint relates to three disputed domain names, namely:

- <incredibox-game.io> registered on May 8, 2024;
- <incrediboxsprunki.io> registered on September 21, 2024; and
- <sprunki-incredibox.io> registered on November 11, 2024.

The Respondents did not file a formal Response, so little information is known about the Respondents.

According to Registrar records, brave kieu (hereafter the “First Respondent”) has an address in Ho Chi Minh, Yemen, which appears to be a false address. The First Respondent is the registrant of <incredibox-game.io> and <incrediboxsprunki.io>.

At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name <incredibox-game.io> redirects to a website at a different domain name. That website is titled “Incre MOD” that promotes a game called “Incredibox Mod”. This website states: “It’s part game, part music creation tool, and all-around fun for people of all ages. This article will dive into the world of Incredibox Mod game, exploring its different versions, gameplay mechanics, and how you can jump in and start creating your own music!” In the footer of this website is the following text: “Disclaimer: Incredibox Sprunki Mod is an independent website and is not affiliated with any organizations.” At the time of submitting the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website titled “Incredibox” with the Complainant’s logo of a black and white image of a man’s face in cartoon format, displaying an online game to play with information related to Incredibox games.

At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name <incrediboxsprunki.io> redirects to a website at another different domain name. That website is titled “Sprunki” and includes the following text: “Incredibox Sprunki MOD Overview. If you’ve played Incredibox before, you know how much fun it can be to mix beats, vocals, and effects to create your own music masterpiece. But what if you could take that experience even further? Enter Incredibox Sprunki MOD, a fan-made mod that adds new layers of creativity and excitement to the popular beatbox game.” In the footer of this website is the following text: “Disclaimer: **Incredibox Sprunki MOD** is an independent website and is not affiliated with any organizations.” At the time of submitting the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website also titled “Sprunki” displaying an online game “Incredibox Sprunki” to play with information related to this game.

According to Registrar records, He Echo (hereafter the “Second Respondent”) has an address in China. The Second Respondent is the registrant of <sprunki-incredibox.io>.

At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name <sprunki-incredibox.io> redirects to a website again at another different domain name. That website is titled “Sprunke Games” and includes the following text: “Play Sprunke Games Online. Sprunke Games is an unofficial fan community platform featuring creative music games. Discover unique fan-made characters and sounds that allow you to create harmonious music tracks.” In the footer of this website is the following text: “© 2025 Fan Community | Not affiliated with So Far So Good | Incredibox® is a registered trademark | Official Site: www.incredibox.com”. At the time of submitting the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website titled “Sprunki Incredibox” and includes the following text: “Sprunki Incredibox is a fan-made modification of the popular music creation game Incredibox, offering unique characters and sounds that allow players to create harmonious tracks in an engaging environment”.

None of the homepages of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve has contact details or names for the owners or controllers of these websites.

In 2024 and 2025, the Complainant’s legal representative sent emails containing legal demands to the Respondents. It is unclear whether such emails were received by the Respondents. No responses were received by the Complainant to such emails.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions:

The use of the Complainant’s marks in the disputed domain names leads the public to believe that the disputed domain names belong to the Respondents whereas it is absolutely not the case.

The Complainant has been using its trademark since 2007.

More than 50 million players worldwide have already enjoyed the Complainant’s game. There have been over one million downloads on Google Play.

The reputation was also increased through marketing operations especially with some international brands eager to offer the “Incredibox” game reshaped at their own graphical chart to their consumers. For example, in 2017 M&M’s asked the Complainant to develop a specific loop of music with its famous candy’s characters (Red, Yellow, Blue, Green, Orange and Brown) singing beatbox sound loops based on how users arrange them on screen: Their own fans could play with them.

The “Incredibox” application has won several awards.

Considering the numbers of followers, the numerous websites, social media and numbers of views on app stores, the Respondents could not ignore the existence of INCREDIBOX trademarks.

According to the Complainant, “Sprunki” is the generic name for describing a modified game that is a “fan-made” modification, developed and generated from Incredibox software, offering a simplified game mod. “Sprunki” was first created by a young teenager fan.

It appears clearly that the Respondents intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondents’ website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondents’ website.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

The First Respondent did not participate in the proceedings.

The Second Respondent sent a series of emails to the Center with various proposals for settlement of this dispute. In part, these emails include the following paragraphs:

“I want to acknowledge and sincerely apologize for any confusion or concern caused by my domain name choice. I deeply respect your intellectual property rights and the incredible work you’ve done with Incredibox. I recognize that my use of your trademark in the domain name was not adequately considered, and I take full responsibility for this oversight.”

“I have no other domains using your trademarks.”

“I notice the WIPO complaint also mentions incredibox-game.io and incrediboxsprunki.io registered to ‘brave kieu’ ([...]@gmail.com). For clarity: **I have no affiliation with those domains or that individual.** My proposal relates solely to sprunki-incredibox.io.”

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

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

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges, in an email to the Center, that “all named Respondents are, in fact, the same entity and that all domain names are under common control”.

The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants, presumably pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. The Complainant does not include detailed submissions in respect of consolidation but points out that the First Respondent has used false

postal address in this case and the email address of the First Respondent is associated with a different postal address in *So Far So Good v. Dung Kieu, ani manga, AM, and ye bin*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2283](#). Therefore, the First Respondent has used false contact details in registering domain names. Following the acknowledgement of the Complaint, the disputed domain names were all changed and moved. Also, the websites at the disputed domain names share identical general appearance.

The First Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request. The Second Respondent denied that he is associated with the First Respondent and the disputed domain name registered with the First Respondent.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)")¹, section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Complainant provides an annexure to support its position. This annexure is one page of source code for <sprunki-incredibox.io> which, as far as the Panel can determine, does not show any association with the First Respondent or the other two disputed domain names.

Two of the disputed domain names, namely <incredibox-game.io> and <incrediboxsprunki.io>, have the same registrant contact details, same address and same email contacts. The Registrar for both of these disputed domain names is the same. The third disputed domain name, <sprunki-incredibox.io>, has a different named registrant, with a different address, and has a different Registrar. Compare *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Tom Copper, Saqib Nizam, Muzammil Khan*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2734](#). The Panel cannot see any connection between the First Respondent and the Second Respondent or the disputed domain names registered by each of them.

While the Complainant asserts that the websites at the disputed domain names share identical general appearance, the Panel finds that the website at the disputed domain name <incredibox-game.io> is substantially different from the websites at the other two disputed domain names. Nevertheless, the Panel notes there are certain similarities between the websites at the disputed domain names <incrediboxsprunki.io> and <sprunki-incredibox.io>, they are not identical.

The evidence and arguments submitted by the Complainant do not sufficiently demonstrate that the three disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant did not provide persuasive evidence to demonstrate that <sprunki-incredibox.io> is connected to the other two disputed domain names. The two Registrars are different as between the disputed domain names registered by the two named Respondents, as are the dates of registration and site content.

It also does not assist the Complainant's position that the Complaint includes the following statement: "We are unable to determine whether all named Respondents are, in fact, the same entity."

Accordingly and also noting the email communication from the second Respondent, the Panel decides to not consolidate the disputes regarding all three disputed domain names in a single proceeding. The Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding <incredibox-game.io> and <incrediboxsprunki.io>.

Accordingly, the proceeding is dismissed regarding <sprunki-incredibox.io>, without prejudice to the filing of a new complaint regarding this disputed domain name.

¹ In light of the substantive and procedural similarities between the .ioDRP and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel has cited decisions under the UDRP and the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), where appropriate.

In the remainder of this decision, the term “disputed domain names” refers to <incredibox-game.io> and <incrediboxsprunki.io> and the term “Respondent” refers to “brave kieu”.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the word part of the Complainant’s mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant’s registered mark includes a cartoon image of a man along with the term “incredibox” in lower case. To the extent that design elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “game” and “sprunki”) 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 proceedings under the Policy is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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 3.0](#), 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 names. The burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent’s websites advertise a “fan-made” modification, developed and generated from the Complainant’s Incredibox software. One of the disputed domain names uses the term “Sprunki” which is not a standard dictionary word but it is used as the name for describing a modified and fan-made series of online

music creation games, inspired by Incredibox game. In some circumstances, fan sites may be fair use under the Policy, and use of the term “Sprunki” in one of the disputed domain

names may signify to Internet users that the website at that disputed domain name is a fan website. However, both the disputed domain names currently divert to other websites that include advertising and/or promotion of third party games. The Panel concludes that such use is not genuine noncommercial use as a fan site. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.7.

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

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must establish that the Respondent registered or used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered or is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

The Respondent is clearly aware of the Complainant. The Respondent is promoting modified games that rely upon the Complainant’s Incredibox software game. The Complainant and the Respondent could be considered competitors. The Respondent is using the disputed domain names to divert consumers to other websites that promote computer games including third party games.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names to intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s websites at the disputed domain names, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s websites which constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The use of a disclaimer by the Respondent in the present case is not sufficient to overcome such likelihood of confusion.

In the circumstances, the Complainant has made out the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

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 names <incredibox-game.io> and <incrediboxsprunki.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

The proceeding is dismissed regarding <sprunki-incredibox.io>, without prejudice to the filing of a new complaint regarding this disputed domain name.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: December 10, 2025