

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GeoGuessr AB v. brave kieu, fred sandersus, fred, and brave andy
Case No. DIO2026-0033

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GeoGuessr AB, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are brave kieu, Viet Nam, fred sandersus, fred, Viet Nam and brave andy, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <guessrgame.io> is registered with Spaceship, Inc.

The disputed domain names <geoguessr.io> and <geoguessrfree.io> are registered with Namecheap, Inc.¹ (collectively, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 9, 2026. On July 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 10, 2026, and July 15, 2026, 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 and contact information in the Complaint (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf). The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 16, 2026.

¹ The Panel notes that incorrect domain names were referenced in the caption of the Complaint. However, the evidence submitted with the Complaint, as well as all of the Center’s communications, correctly refer to the domain names <geoguessr.io> and <geoguessrfree.io>.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 July 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on August 31, 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 not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondents regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), “to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent”. Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondents.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreements, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Swedish company founded in 2013, providing an online geography game with over 100 million players in more than 140 countries, and owning several trademark registrations for GEOGUESSR, including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018485909 for GEOGUESSR, registered on September 30, 2021;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1629478 for GEOGUESSR, registered on July 9, 2021, and designating, inter alia, the United States and Viet Nam, namely the Respondents’ countries; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1589907 for GEOGUESSR and design, registered on March 1, 2021, and designating, inter alia, the United States and Viet Nam, namely the Respondents’ countries.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, with its official website being “www.geoguessr.com”.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <geoguessr.io> on September 26, 2024, <geoguessrfree.io> on February 25, 2025, and <guessrgame.io> on June 2, 2026, and are currently inactive. However, when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names were used to host commercial websites, or to redirect traffic to them, on which the Complainant's trademark was displayed to promote a variety of competing products or services not related to the Complainant, while the footer of the websites was stating that "GeoGuessr Free is an independent website". The domain name <geoguessr.io> redirected to the website at <guessrgame.io>.

On June 1, 2026, the Complainant's legal representatives sent a cease-and-desist letter concerning some of the disputed domain names to the Respondents, without receiving any reply.

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.

Notably, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name <geoguessr.io> is identical and the disputed domain names <guessrgame.io> and <geoguessrfree.io> are confusingly similar to its trademark GEOGUESSR.

Further to section 6.1 below, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain names are under common control and thus addresses the Respondents in the singular. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain names or to use its trademark within the disputed domain names, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names, when the Complaint was filed, were used to host commercial websites, or to redirect traffic to them, on which the Complainant's trademark was displayed to promote a variety of competing products or services not related to the Complainant, although the website carried a disclaimer "GeoGuessr Free is an independent website", it did not accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark GEOGUESSR is well known as an online geography game. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, and the Complainant contends that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names with the purpose to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to an affiliation between the websites at the Respondent's domain names and the Complainant, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondents

The Respondents have made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and are in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(e) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.3.²

² 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 3.1](#), where appropriate.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The Complainant has requested consolidation of disputes and stated that the disputed domain names belong to the same person or organization. No objection to this request was made by the Respondents.

Pursuant to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2, “[w]here a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario”. The Panel may consider a range of factors to determine whether consolidation is appropriate, such as examining relevant registrant contact information, and any naming patterns in the disputed domain names, or other evidence of respondent affiliation that indicate common control of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant’s consolidation request is based on the following factors:

- the registrant names appear to be most likely false, incomplete, or misleading;
- the websites at the disputed domain names show plenty of similarities and contain identical wordings;
- the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively limited period of time, between September 26, 2024, and June 2, 2026;
- the disputed domain names incorporate the same registered trademark, that is GEOGUESSR, or confusingly similar variant thereof;
- the disputed domain names are all registered through Namecheap and Spaceship, two registrars within the same company group; and
- the disputed domain names all use Cloudflare name servers.

The Panel notes that all the disputed domain names use the “.io” country-code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”), as well as the same structure by reproducing the Complainant’s trademark GEOGUESSR on its own (i.e. <geoguessr.io>), and the Complainant’s trademark GEOGUESSR (i.e. <geoguessrfree.io>) or a part of it, namely “GUESSR”, (i.e. <guessrgame.io>), in association with the terms “free” or “game”, which are terms related to the online gaming field. Further, the same email address was provided in the registration data for the domain names <geoguessr.io> and <guessrgame.io>, and the domain names <guessrgame.io> and <geoguessrfree.io> were used in the same manner and featured the same disclaimer text.

The Panel finds that there is evidence that the disputed domain names are subject to common control, and that it would be procedurally efficient, fair, and equitable to all Parties to accept the Complainant’s consolidation request. The Panel further notes that the Respondents did not object to the consolidation request. The Panel therefore accepts the Complainant’s consolidation request. Hereinafter, the Panel will refer to the Respondents in the singular, i.e., “the Respondent”.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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 or are being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant is the owner of the registered trademark GEOGUESSR.

The Panel finds the mark GEOGUESSR is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <geoguessr.io> is identical and the disputed domain names <guessrgame.io> and <geoguessrfree.io> are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here “game” and “free”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a ccTLD, in this case “.io”, is typically ignored when assessing the identity or confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore met its burden of proving that the disputed domain names are identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation:

- “(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain names or a name corresponding to the domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain names, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the three elements of the Policy. However, satisfying the burden of proving a lack of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is potentially quite difficult, since proving a negative circumstance is generally more complicated than establishing a positive one. As such, it is well accepted that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names in order to shift the burden of production to the Respondent. If the Respondent fails to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or on any other basis, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the 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 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 Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services because the Respondent provides information about the Complainant's game on the websites and is purportedly promoting a variety of competing products or services not related to the Complainant, while prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark. The Panel further notes that, although the website footer carried an easily overlooked statement "GeoGuessr Free is an independent website", such a disclaimer was not prominent, did not identify the websites' operator and, in the circumstances of this case, does not render the Respondent's activities bona fide under the Policy.

As regards the disputed domain name <geoguessr.io>, the Panel notes that a respondent's use of a complainant's mark to redirect users (e.g., to a competing site) would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names, coupled with their use, indicates the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

While paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires a demonstration that a domain name has either been registered or is being used in bad faith, the Complainant has argued that the Respondent has both registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that "for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii), the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or ha[s] acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) that [the respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that [the respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the complainant; or
- (iv) that by using the domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location".

Regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark GEOGUESSR as an online geography game is clearly established and the Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not knew of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain names were used in relation to websites on which the Complainant's trademark was reproduced and a variety of competing products or services not related to the Complainant were purportedly promoted.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names are also being used in bad faith since the Respondent was trying to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the disputed domain names' source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business. The mere presence of a vague easily overlooked disclaimer cannot cure the Respondent's bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and was using the disputed domain names in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, and to attract Internet users to its websites in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

As regards the current passive holding of the disputed domain names, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark as an online geography game, the composition of the disputed domain names (identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark), the previous use of the disputed domain names, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a Response or provide any explanation for its motivations in registering the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has presented evidence to satisfy its burden of proof with respect to the issue of whether the Respondent has registered or is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

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 <guessrgame.io>, <geoguessr.io> and <geoguessrfree.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2026