

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Liam Domains, TopDrawer Management
Case No. D2025-0674

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Liam Domains, TopDrawer Management, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansjob.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 19, 2025. On February 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 6, 2025, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 7, 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 7, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 March 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Harini Narayanswamy as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 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 in the business of hosting a social media platform where users can post and subscribe to audio visual content. The Complainant operates its website from the domain name <onlyfans.com>, which was registered in 2013.

The Complainant owns the ONLYFANS trademark and its variants ONLYFANS.COM and OFTV. Trademark registrations for the marks are held by the Complainant in numerous jurisdictions, with the earliest trademark registration in the year 2018. Some of the trademark registrations for the ONLYFANS mark include:

United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00917912377 for word mark ONLYFANS, with filing date June 5, 2018, date of entry in the register January 9, 2019, under classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.

United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00917946559 for device/stylized mark ONLYFANS, with filing date August 22, 2018, date of entry in the register January 9, 2019, under classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.

United States of America trademark registration No. 5,769,267 for word mark ONLYFANS, filed on October 29, 2018, registered on June 4, 2019, under international class 35.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 4, 2024. At the time of filing the present Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a site that displayed various job listings such as “Bi-Lingual Free Account Chatters (English/Spanish), Salary: Competitive, Work Location: Remote”; “Free Account Chatters (English Speaking)”; and “Multifaceted chat Team Administrator (English speaking)”. Some job listings “OnlyFansChatter (English speaking)” and “Bi-Lingual OnlyFansChatter (English /Spanish)” indicate salary figures of \$3- \$7.

The Respondent’s website also displays the Complainant’s logo, stylized letters “O” and “F” in different shades of blue. The logo is a registered trademark owned by the Complainant and is displayed on the Respondent’s website along with the words “Job Search”. At the bottom of the page the logo is displayed again with a message that states: “Discover unparalleled support and growth opportunities with our OnlyFans chatting recruitment agency, where we connect creators with dedicated chat professionals to enhance fan engagement and maximize earnings”.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist notice to the Respondent on October 16, 2024. There was no response or reply from the Respondent.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that its website is very popular and has more than 305 million registered users. Due to its popularity, the Complainant claims that it has become a target for cyber-squatters who wish to exploit the goodwill associated with its mark.

The Complainant contends that apart from its registered rights in the ONLYFANS mark, it has extensive common law rights in the mark throughout the world which commenced from the year 2016. The Complainant asserts that its rights in its trademark had accrued prior to the registration of the disputed domain name on August 4, 2024.

The Complainant states that over one hundred and fifty previous UDRP decisions have recognized its rights in the mark, resulting in transfer of the disputed domain names. In *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Admin. Beacons AI Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0113](#), it was recognized that the Complainant's common law rights in the ONLYFANS mark had accrued from the year 2016 and in *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. D2021-0327, the international fame associated with its mark was recognized.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark and the addition of the term "job" does not prevent confusing similarity. The Complainant argues that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Notably, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to mislead and attract for commercial gain Internet users to the Respondent's website or online location due to confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark, which constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant in these proceedings is required to establish three elements under paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name, these are:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

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 provided evidence of its registered rights in the trademark. The Complainant has accordingly established rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name consists of the mark and the term "job". It is well established in UDRP cases that where the trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name, any additional terms or words does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark. The mark is entirely reproduced within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of the term "job" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the term "job" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. 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 Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name and has not shown any legitimate reasons for use of the term “Only Fans” in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage that displays the Complainant’s logo and job listings. The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent has no authorization or license to use the Complainant’s mark or its logo.

The Panel further finds that there is no disclaimer on the Respondent’s website and the Respondent does not disclose the lack of relationship with the Complainant. An impression of implied affiliation with the Complainant and its mark is therefore created by the use of the trademark in disputed domain name, which is likely to mislead Internet users. The Panel finds that the Respondent, who is unauthorized to use the ONLY FANS mark, is attempting to impersonate the Complainant or show a false affiliation.

The Panel finds use of the mark in the disputed domain name and the evidence of use of the Complainant’s logo is with an intention to mislead Internet users. Such use is not bona fide use or fair use under the circumstances discussed and is not indicative of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

In the light of the discussed circumstances, the Panel finds that 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 participated in these proceedings or provided 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 third element under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy specifies 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may also be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for 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 that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) 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) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) 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.

The Panel finds there is sufficient evidence to support the Complainant's submissions that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in a manner as described under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. If there are circumstances that show the Respondent ought to have knowledge of the trademark and registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant's trademark it is indicative of bad faith.

Evidence filed by the Complainant shows that the Complainant's logo has been used on the Respondent's website. The Panel finds, based on the evidence, the Respondent's use of the Complainant's well-known trademark and the Complainant's logo displayed on the website indicates that the Respondent ought to have known of the Complainant's mark and the logo when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has provided sufficient evidence in these proceedings to show that its mark is distinctive and reputed. The Respondent has used the mark unauthorizably to unfairly benefit from the confusing similarity between the mark and the disputed domain name.

It is not likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without intending to create an inferred association with the Complainant's well-known mark. An unsuspecting Internet user who views the website would be misled. In other words, the Respondent has knowingly and intentionally tried to impersonate the Complainant for purposes of misleading and confusing Internet users.

In the light of all that has been discussed, the Panel concludes that the discussed circumstances show that the registration and use of the disputed domain name targets the Complainant's mark and attempts to impersonate the Complainant to attract Internet users to its website, which constitutes bad faith as understood under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the available evidence on record and the entire set of circumstances described here, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith as described 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 <onlyfansjob.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Harini Narayanswamy/

Harini Narayanswamy

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2025