

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Emre Demir, Sensizlik
Case No. D2025-1814

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Emre Demir, Sensizlik, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansescorto.com> 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 May 6, 2025. On May 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 8, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 May 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Felipe Claro as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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 owns and operates the website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com> and has used its site for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual online content. In providing its services, the Complainant has made extensive use of the ONLYFANS trademark.

The Complainant has registered marks at least with the European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”), the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (“UKIPO”), and the United States of America Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), and the Complainant has developed extensive common law rights in the ONLYFANS trademark.

In 2025 the website “www.onlyfans.com” is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users and the Complainant contends it has become a prime target for cybersquatters wishing to profit from the Complainant’s goodwill in its ONLYFANS trademark.

The Complainant owns the following registered trademarks, among many others:

1. ONLYFANS, USPTO Reg. 5769267, registered June 4, 2019, in class 35;
2. ONLYFANS.COM, USPTO Reg. 5769268, June 4, 2019, in class 35; and
3. ONLYFANS, USPTO Reg. 6253455, January 26, 2021, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 8, 2024, and, at the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a website which used the Complainant’s “OnlyFans” brand name and favicon, and advertised escort services.

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 name.

The Respondent is attempting to aggregate online traffic with the disputed domain name for fraudulent means and to cause confusion. The Respondent has used the Complainant’s famous mark in the disputed domain name which not only demonstrates the Respondent’s intention to capitalize on notorious brand recognition but also to attract customers to the Respondent’s website with a nearly identical disputed domain name to the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark and its domain name <onlyfans.com>.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In view of the lack of a response filed by the Respondent as required under paragraph 5 of the Rules, this proceeding has proceeded by way of default. Hence, under paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel is directed to decide this administrative proceeding based on the Complainant’s undisputed representations. In that regard the Panel makes the following specific 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Panels have also found that the overall facts and circumstances of a case (including relevant website content) may support a finding of confusing similarity, particularly where it appears that the respondent registered the domain name precisely because it believed that the domain name was confusingly similar to a mark held by the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. Therefore, the Panel finds the additional term "escorto" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 Respondent's website under the disputed domain name <onlyfansescorto.com> is aggregating online traffic to cause confusion with the Complainant's prior registered and widely-known trademark. "Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar [...] to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith." [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website which has used the Complainant's "OnlyFans" brand name and favicon, and advertises escort services. Panels have held that the respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark is evidence of bad faith conduct pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 name <onlyfansescorto.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Felipe Claro/
Felipe Claro
Sole Panelist
Date: July 7, 2025