ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
InnerSloth LLC v. brave andy
Case No. DIO2026-0044

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is brave andy, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amongusfree.io> ("Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 1, 2026. On September 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 2, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 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 September 8, 2026.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 30, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on October 13, 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

Complainant is a game development studio based in the United States, best known for creating Among Us, a globally popular multiplayer social deduction game. Complainant's Among Us game was released in 2018, and earned numerous awards and accolades, including The Game Awards for (i) Best Multiplayer Game and (ii) Best Mobile Game in 2020.

Complainant's Among Us game has achieved commercial success, being downloaded hundreds of millions of times on all major platforms, including mobile devices, PC, and consoles. In 2020, the game had already reached 300 million Monthly Active Users, with 60 million Daily Active Players in late 2020, and over 300 million downloads in the same year.

Complainant owns several trademark registrations for AMONG US and AMONG US and Design in numerous jurisdictions worldwide (the "AMONG US Marks") including:

- Chinese trademark registration No.: 55452011 for AMONG US and Design registered on December 21, 2022;
- European Union trademark registration No.: 018384304 for AMONG US registered on June 24, 2021;
- European Union trademark registration No.: 018384099 for AMONG US and Design registered on June 24, 2021; and
- United States trademark registration No.: 6891716 for AMONG US registered on November 8, 2022.

The Disputed Domain Name <amongusfree.io> was registered on July 31, 2025 and is currently inactive but previously resolved to a website which appeared to let users play the Among Us game. The website included a header similar to Complainant's design mark, and displayed Complainant's "crewmate" character created for the Among Us game. The website included a disclaimer at the bottom of the website stating that: "Among Us Free is an independent website and is not affiliated with any organizations".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for AMONG US worldwide. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates, in its second level portion, Complainant's AMONG US trademark in its entirety, followed by the relevant term "free". The addition of the term "free" in the second level portion of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity to the trademark. The addition of the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".io" in the Disputed Domain Name is a standard, technical registration requirement, and, as such, it may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered by Respondent well after the registration of Complainant's trademarks.

Complainant has not licensed or authorized Respondent to use Complainant's trademark. Respondent is not affiliated to Complainant. Complainant did not authorize Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name incorporating the AMONG US trademark nor has Complainant endorsed or sponsored Respondent. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Respondent is known by the Disputed Domain Name terms nor owns any corresponding registered trademarks.

The structure of the Disputed Domain Name – incorporating the AMONG US trademark in its entirety alongside with the relevant term “free” - may falsely lead Internet users to believe that it is connected to Complainant, which is not the case. The Disputed Domain Name - at the time of filing the Complaint – resolved to an active website that reproduced Complainant’s AMONG US trademark(s) and offered an unauthorized and playable version/imitation of Complainant’s Among Us video game, including a description of the official game and its game rules, as well as several unrelated third-party browser games.

The website at the Disputed Domain Name served several advertisements to Internet users, either when simply resolving the domain name and accessing the corresponding landing page, or when interacting with the website’s functionalities. As such, the aforementioned use of the Disputed Domain Name could not amount to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain.

It is therefore inconceivable that Respondent was unaware of the existence of Complainant when it registered the Disputed Domain Name.

Respondent was fully aware of Complainant’s rights at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Name, given that the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name contains the AMONG US trademark in its entirety, along with relevant term “free”, Indeed, the inclusion of the term “free” alongside the AMONG US trademark in the Disputed Domain Name is a strong indicator of bad faith registration, as it reveals that Respondent knew Complainant and its trademark at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Name, and that it did so in order to confuse consumers/Internet users by creating a similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and Complainant.

The Disputed Domain Name resolved—at the time of filing the Complaint—to an active website that reproduced Complainant’s AMONG US trademark and offered an unauthorized and playable version/imitation of Complainant’s Among Us video game, including a description of the official game and its game rules, as well as several unrelated third-party browser games.

The website at the Disputed Domain Name served several advertisements to Internet users, either when simply resolving the domain name and accessing the corresponding landing page, or when interacting with the website’s functionalities and when clicking on the “Contact Us” section of the website, users were then re-directed to a subdomain path of the Disputed Domain Name which presented a form inviting users to input personal information, such as their name and email address. Such behavior clearly highlights that Respondent’s intention in registering and operating the Disputed Domain Name was to attract Internet users to the same, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, and in order to obtain a commercial gain.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated it owns long-standing registered trademark rights in the AMONG US mark. The ccTLD “.io” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the AMONG US mark in its entirety. The addition of the other term “free” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and Complainant’s mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark in which Complainant has rights and the first element of the Policy is established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates Complainant's registered and well-known AMONG US trademark and resolved to a website that previously featured Complainant's game as well as links to Complainant's competitors indicates to the Panel that Respondent likely sought to impersonate Complainant and piggyback on the mark for potential illegitimate purposes.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd*., WIPO Case No. D2003-0455 and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Here, Respondent has failed to participate in the proceedings and as such, it did not provide any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the nature and use of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of an implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by Complainant. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting Complainant's prima facie case indicating Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 name in bad faith. Unlike the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), under the Policy, it is sufficient for the complainant to prove that either registration or use of the domain name is in bad faith, whereas the UDRP requires the complainant to prove both.

In this case the Panel has determined Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered years after Complainant first registered and used its AMONG US mark. The evidence on the record provided by Complainant is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, Respondent undoubtedly knew of Complainant's AMONG US mark.

Further, the Panel finds the use of the Disputed Domain Name by Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt 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. The evidence, including the historical website content and composition of the Disputed Domain Name, shows that Respondent had created a website at the Disputed Domain Name similar to Complainant's official website with the intention to confuse unsuspecting Internet users into believing that the Disputed Domain Name is operated by Complainant. Considering then the circumstances described in this case, the disclaimer on the Respondent's website does not cure its bad faith but rather functions as an admission by the Respondent that Internet users may be confused. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.7.

In the absence of any evidence or explanation from Respondent, the Panel finds that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name have been made for bad faith purposes.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <amongusfree.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/
Colin T. O'Brien
Sole Panelist
Date: October 27, 2026