

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Alan XI
Case No. D2025-0487

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Alan XI, Australia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <vkonlyfans-th.com>, <vkonlyfans11.com>, <vkonlyfans22.com>, <vkonlyfans33.com>, and <vkonlyfans69.com> (collectively referred to as the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 6, 2025. On February 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On February 7, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 10, 2025, 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 February 10, 2025.

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 February 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Rachel Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on March 19, 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 company which provides a social media platform at the website “www.onlyfans.com” that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the Internet. According to the Complainant, its website is one of the most popular websites in the world with more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant is the owner of the ONLYFANS mark in various jurisdictions. For example, International Registration No. 1507723 for ONLYFANS, registered on November 2, 2019 in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42, designating inter alia, Australia; United States Registration No. 5769267 for ONLYFANS, registered on June 4, 2019 in Class 35; and European Union Trade Mark No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019 in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.

Separately, the Complainant operates and is the registrant of the domain name <onlyfans.com> (registered on January 29, 2013). The Complainant uses its ONLYFANS mark on the website.

On October 4, 2024, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent with demands to stop using and cancel the Disputed Domain Names. At the time of the Complaint, there was no response from the Respondent to the letter.

The Disputed Domain Names were all registered by the Respondent on June 29, 2024. At the time of the Complaint and Decision, the Disputed Domain Names <vkonlyfans-th.com>, <vkonlyfans11.com>, <vkonlyfans22.com>, and <vkonlyfans69.com> resolved to active webpages which contain pornography and adult entertainment content and feature logos that incorporate the word “Onlyfans”. In respect of <vkonlyfans33.com>, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an active pay-per-click (“PPC”) webpage that lists out multiple third-party links relating to different advertisements.

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 contends that the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ONLYFANS mark. Each of the Disputed Domain Names incorporates the Complainant’s mark in its entirety with an additional prefix “vk”, which is commonly used for Asian adult entertainment. In addition, the Disputed Domain Names contain an additional suffix with a number or a term (i.e. “11”, “22”, “33”, “69”, and “-th”) (as applicable). The Complainant argues that these additional prefix and suffixes do not avoid a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant’s mark. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), i.e. “.com”, is also disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its ONLYFANS mark or to register any domain name incorporating the mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names. In addition, the Respondent offers adult entertainment services in at least four of the Disputed Domain Names, which is in direct competition with the Complainant’s services. The websites at the Disputed Domain Names also contain logos that are similar to Complainant’s registered ONLYFANS mark, in an attempt to pass his websites off as those of the Complainant. Based on

the Respondent's activities, the Complainant argued that he has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Given the substantial worldwide recognition, the Complainant claims that the ONLYFANS mark is well-known. In addition, the Respondent's websites also contain logos that are similar to the Complainant's registered ONLYFANS mark. This demonstrates that the Respondent either knew or should have known of the Complainant's marks at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Names. Separately, the Complainant claims that the Respondent is a serial cyber squatter who repeatedly registered domain names that contain the Complainant's mark without authorization. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Names are being used by the Respondent to access websites that offer adult entertainment content (including content pirated from Complainant's users) with a similar logo as that of the Complainant's mark, which is clear proof of bad faith. The Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter of October 4, 2024 is also evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, i.e. "vk", "11", "22", "33", "69", and "-th" (as applicable), 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Lastly, it is permissible for the Panel to disregard the applicable gTLD in the Disputed Domain Names, i.e., ".com". [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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 UDRP proceedings 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 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 has not provided evidence of a legitimate or noncommercial use of the Disputed Domain Names, or reasons to justify the choice of the Disputed Domain Names that are confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark. There is also no indication to show that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names or otherwise has rights or legitimate interests in any of them. Moreover, the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark or register the Disputed Domain Names.

B1. The Use of the Disputed Domain Names <vkonlyfans-th.com>, <vkonlyfans11.com>, <vkonlyfans22.com>, and <vkonlyfans69.com>

In respect of <vkonlyfans-th.com>, <vkonlyfans11.com>, <vkonlyfans22.com>, and <vkonlyfans69.com>, the Panel notes that each of the Disputed Domain Names resolves to an active website which clearly and prominently displays, a similar logo that incorporates the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark and no statement or disclaimer disclosing accurately the (lack of) relationship between the Parties. Moreover, these websites provide adult entertainment content, including pirated versions of content uploaded by the Complainant's users, which is in direct competition with the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not offering goods or services in good faith for the purpose of the Policy, nor can the use by the Respondent qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the scope of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. See *Fenix International Limited v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Rob Visser*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1897](#)).

B2. The Use of the Disputed Domain Name <vkonlyfans33.com>

In respect of Disputed Domain Name <vkonlyfans33.com>, it currently resolves to an active PPC webpage with links to third-party websites. Prior UDRP panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. See section 2.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Finally, the nature of the Disputed Domain Names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the well-known status of the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark was recognized in previous UDRP decisions. See *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#). The Disputed

Domain Names were all registered long after the registration of the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark. The Respondent's websites in relation to the Disputed Domain Names <vkonlyfans-th.com>, <vkonlyfans11.com>, <vkonlyfans22.com>, and <vkonlyfans69.com> also contain logos that are similar to the Complainant's registered ONLYFANS mark, and offer content, including material that pirated from Complainant's users. As such, the Panel considers that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark when registering the Disputed Domain Names.

The Panel is of the view that by using the Disputed Domain Names as discussed above, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites. This demonstrates bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names, as provided in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent appears to be engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations, having registered multiple domain names comprising of the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark. The Panel finds this case is a continuation of that bad faith pattern. See *Fenix International Limited v. Alan XI*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1583](#). Such use constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use as contemplated under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy

The Respondent has kept silent in the face of the Complainant's allegations of bad faith both in response to the cease-and-desist letter and in response to the Complaint in this proceeding. Taking into account these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant before registering the Disputed Domain Names and, considering the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests, and by registering and using the Disputed Domain Names as discussed above, the Panel is led to conclude that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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 <vkonlyfans-th.com>, <vkonlyfans11.com>, <vkonlyfans22.com>, <vkonlyfans33.com>, and <vkonlyfans69.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rachel Tan/

Rachel Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: March 28, 2025