

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. OnlyforFanz

Case No. D2025-0805

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is OnlyforFanz, South Africa.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <only4fanz.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 26, 2025. On February 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 27, 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”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 11, 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 11, 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 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Thomas M. Legler as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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 an online platform for audiovisual content subscription services. The platform allows creators to publish content and users to subscribe, access, and interact with such content. The Complainant operates its primary business from the domain name <onlyfans.com>, registered on January 29, 2013.

The Complainant relies on both registered and unregistered trademark rights in the mark ONLYFANS in connection with its platform and services.

Among many others, it holds the following registered trademark rights:

1. Jurisdiction: European Union,
Reg. No.: 017912377,
Date of Registration: January 9, 2019,
Goods/Services: Classes including subscription services and online entertainment platforms;
2. Jurisdiction: United Kingdom,
Reg. No.: UK00917912377,
Date of Registration: January 9, 2019;
3. Jurisdiction: United States,
Reg. No.: 5769267,
Date of Registration: June 4, 2019,
Goods/Services: Online subscription services and digital content platforms.

The trademarks are registered in the name of the Complainant and have no disclaimers recorded in the respective registrations. Additional registrations exist across multiple jurisdictions under the Madrid Protocol; however, the above are the primary relied-upon marks.

The Complainant also has been found to have common law trade mark rights as it used the ONLYFANS mark extensively and continuously in commerce since at least July 4, 2016, recognized in prior UDRP decisions, such as *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Admin, Beacons AI Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0113](#). The Complainant owns and actively operates the domain <onlyfans.com>, the center of its branding and service delivery.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on September 30, 2024, demanding cessation of use of the disputed domain name. No response was received.

The disputed domain name <only4fanz.com> was registered on May 23, 2024. According to the evidence provided, the disputed domain name resolved to a commercial website that facilitates subscriptions to adult content services. The offering overlaps with the Complainant's services and targets a similar user base.

The Respondent is identified as "OnlyforFanz" based in South Africa per Whois records.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

First, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ONLYFANS mark. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name replicates its well-known mark with only the insertion of a single numeral, which does not avoid confusing similarity. The Complainant points to its extensive trademark rights across multiple jurisdictions and decades-long usage of the ONLYFANS mark in global commerce, particularly in connection with audiovisual content subscription services.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized to use the Complainant's marks, and has no known trademarks or business operations under the ONLYFANS name. The Complainant emphasizes that the website linked to the disputed domain name offers adult content subscriptions directly competing with the Complainant's services, further evidencing the lack of legitimate interest.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant highlights that the disputed domain name was registered long after its trademarks had become well-established and internationally recognized, and that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to operate a competing platform. The Complainant also notes that the Respondent failed to respond to a cease-and-desist letter and has employed a privacy shield — both of which support a finding of bad faith. Citing numerous WIPO precedents, the Complainant argues that this conduct clearly indicates an intent to trade on the Complainant's goodwill.

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. As such, the Panel proceeds on the basis of the evidence submitted by the Complainant. The lack of response allows the Panel to draw appropriate inferences where supported by the record, particularly with regard to the absence of rights or legitimate interests and the Respondent's bad faith.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well established that the first element of the Policy serves primarily as a standing requirement, necessitating a straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark rights 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 demonstrated trademark rights in the ONLYFANS mark through registrations in multiple jurisdictions, predating the registration of the disputed domain name by several years.

The Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name, with the Respondent merely having inserting the numeral "4" between the elements of the mark and replacing the letter "s" with the letter "z". According to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9, the addition or insertion of

numerals or letters, particularly in an otherwise identical or confusingly similar domain name, does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

Moreover, the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is disregarded in the comparison for the purposes of this element ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark.

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 may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative.” Where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent ([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.

Indeed, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its ONLYFANS trademark, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3).

In addition, the Respondent’s use of the inherently misleading disputed domain name — to operate a commercial website directly competing with the Complainant’s business by offering adult content subscription services — is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.2, 2.5).

The Respondent has not rebutted this prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1).

The Panel therefore finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, bad faith is found where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark was already internationally well known when the disputed domain name was registered on May 23, 2024. Given the distinctive nature of the ONLYFANS trademark and its global reach, including more than 305 million registered users and widespread media recognition, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration.

The use of the disputed domain name to offer adult content subscription services, directly competing with those of the Complainant, reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, seeking to mislead Internet users for commercial gain ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

Additional indicators of bad faith include the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter sent on September 30, 2024, or the present Complaint.

Based on the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent's actions fall squarely within the circumstances of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has 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 <only4fanz.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Thomas M. Legler/

Thomas M. Legler

Sole Panelist

Date: April 22, 2025