ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
InnerSloth LLC v. Dung Kieu
Case No. DIO2026-0046

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Dung Kieu, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amongusonline.io> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 2, 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 5, 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 the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 10, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed David Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on October 19, 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 United States limited liability company operating as an independent game development studio. Founded in 2015, it is best known as the developer and publisher of the multiplayer social deduction video game "Among Us", which was released in 2018.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for AMONG US, including:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 018384304, AMONG US, registered on June 24, 2021;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 018384099, AMONG US (figurative), registered on June 24, 2021; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 6891716, AMONG US, registered on November 8, 2022.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 26, 2024. At the time of submission of the Complaint to the Center, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website (the "Respondent's website") that displayed the Complainant's AMONG US trademark, offered a playable version of the Complainant's Among Us game, contained descriptions of the Among Us game and its rules, and included links to other browser-based games. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asserts rights in the AMONG US trademark. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that it has never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the AMONG US mark or to register a domain name incorporating that mark. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. According to the Complaint, the Respondent's website prominently displayed the Complainant's AMONG US branding and offered access to an online version of the Complainant's Among Us game together with links to other games. The Complainant contends that such use sought to capitalize on the reputation of the AMONG US mark and falsely suggested an association with the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any name corresponding to the AMONG US mark. The Complainant additionally notes that the Respondent's website included a contact form requesting users' personal information, including names and email addresses, which it characterizes as reinforcing the misleading nature of the Respondent's website.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was both registered and has been used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the AMONG US mark is well known internationally as a result of the popularity and commercial success of its video game and that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant observes that the Respondent's website reproduced the Complainant's branding, descriptions of the game, and game-related content. According to the Complainant, these circumstances demonstrate that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and its trademark. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent used the disputed domain name intentionally to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood

of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. The Complainant submits that such use was intended to generate commercial benefit through traffic to the website and links to other games. The Complainant also points to the Respondent's use of a privacy service as an additional factor supporting bad faith. Finally, the Complainant contends that the subsequent deactivation of the website does not cure the Respondent's bad-faith conduct and that the surrounding circumstances support a finding that the disputed domain name was both registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

(i) The disputed domain name is 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 name; and
(iii) The disputed domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith.

Noting the substantive and procedural similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel has referred to cases decided under the UDRP as well as principles as expressed in the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), where appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the AMONG US trademark. The registration details of the Complainant's trademark rights are set out in the factual background section above.

The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant's AMONG US trademark in its entirety, omitting the space between the two words, followed by the term "online". In cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. The Panel finds that the inclusion of the term "online" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark, which remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel finds the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's AMONG US trademark. The Panel finds that the requirements of the first element of the Policy have been satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may demonstrate a respondent's rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

The record shows that, prior to the commencement of this proceeding, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that prominently displayed the Complainant's AMONG US trademark, offered a playable version of the Complainant's Among Us game, contained descriptions of that game and its rules, and included links to other browser-based games. In the Panel's view, such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Rather, the Respondent used a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety to host a website that created a clear impression of association with the Complainant and its game. Such use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. See *InnerSloth LLC v. Dylan Chen*, WIPO Case No. D2026-3676.

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

Nor is there any evidence that the Respondent has made any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Rather, the nature of the disputed domain name and the content previously available on the Respondent's website support the conclusion that the Respondent sought to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant and its trademark. The Panel notes in this regard that the disputed domain name combines the Complainant's trademark with the term "online", a term that is directly relevant to the online availability and play of the Complainant's game. In the circumstances, this composition carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or otherwise demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy have therefore been satisfied.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith.

The disputed domain name was registered in July 2024, several years after the Complainant acquired registered trademark rights and after the release of the Complainant's Among Us game. Moreover, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and combines it with the term "online", a term directly related to the manner in which the Complainant's game may be accessed and played. The Respondent's subsequent use of the disputed domain name, discussed below, leaves no doubt that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its AMONG US trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name further demonstrates such targeting. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that displayed the Complainant's AMONG US trademark, offered a playable version of the Complainant's Among Us game, contained descriptions of the game and its rules, and included links to other browser-based games. The Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent sought to divert Internet users seeking the Complainant or its Among Us game to the Respondent's website by creating a misleading impression of association with the Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website. Having regard to the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name and all of the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that the Respondent's current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not negate the Respondent's prior bad-faith conduct.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have therefore 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 <amongusonline.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David Taylor/
David Taylor
Sole Panelist
Date: November 3, 2026