

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Zhichao Yang
Case No. D2025-0849

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Zhichao Yang, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <fanaonly.com>, <fandsonly.com>, <fanysonly.com>, <onlybfans.com>, <onlycfans.com>, <onlyhfans.com>, <onlyrfans.com>, <onlysfana.com>, <onlysfand.com>, <onlyufans.com> are registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 28, 2025. On March 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 6, 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) 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 amended Complaint on March 7, 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 March 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Christopher J. Pibus as the sole panelist in this matter on April 17, 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 carries on business in the United Kingdom and internationally in the field of adult entertainment services, in association with its ONLYFANS trademark and its Internet presence through its primary website at “onlyfans.com”. The Complainant has established a global reputation in a relatively short period of time. Since its launch in 2016, the Complainant has rapidly grown its customer base to the point where it has reached more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant has used its marks in commerce for more than nine years and owns the following registrations among its international portfolio:

- ONLYFANS, United States trademark Registration No. 5769267, dated June 4, 2019, in Class 35;
- ONLYFANS, United States trademark Registration No. 6253455, dated January 26, 2021, in Class 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain names were registered on July 9, 2024, and all of them currently redirect to an active third party website, which features adult entertainment content.

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 its ONLYFANS trademarks are widely known around the world, through its massive network of registered users. The Complainant draws attention to the fact that prior panels have recognized that its trademarks are well known and are therefore worthy of an extensive ambit of protection. In the circumstances, the Complainant urges the Panel to find deliberate targeting of the well known mark for improper purposes. Because it operates one of the most visited websites in the world, it has become a target for cybersquatters wishing to trade on the goodwill that the Complainant has garnered in the ONLYFANS mark. The Complainant has been active in enforcing its rights against third parties who have adopted confusingly similar domain names, successfully asserting its marks against more than 150 entities who attempted to use and register ONLYFANS-formative domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Consolidation

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. Zhichao Yang has now been identified as the registrant for all the domain names in dispute, and accordingly it is appropriate to deal with this matter in a single proceeding.

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 the existence of relevant trademarks, by providing proof of a number of registrations including those listed in paragraph 4 above. Detailed evidence of acquired reputation in the ONLYFANS brand since 2016 has also been provided to support the conclusion that the mark is well known internationally. The Panel concludes that the Complainant has established that it owns sufficient rights, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The dominant elements of the ONLYFANS mark have been reproduced within the disputed domain names and 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.

The disputed domain names each consist of the Complainant's ONLY and FANS elements combined with a random or meaningless additional letter or two, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity. See *Fenix International Limited v. AMF AMF*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3377](#). Although the addition of one or two random letters in the disputed domain names may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such minor variants 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](#), sections 1.8 and 1.9.

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. In particular, the Complainant has presented evidence of the massive international reputation it has garnered for the ONLYFANS brand and has put forward cogent evidence and submissions that the Respondent has not been commonly known under the ONLYFANS name, nor has he ever been licensed or otherwise authorized to register or use the mark. As noted above, each disputed domain name redirects to a website which offers adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant's services. Using a disputed domain name to direct users to commercial websites that advertise goods and services in direct competition with the trademark owner does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests. See *Fenix International Limited v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC. / Jason Douglas*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0829](#). 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 finds that the Respondent was intentionally targeting the Complainant's famous trademark, by reproducing the dominant elements of the ONLYFANS mark in the disputed domain names, with minor variations. The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's trademark, as the disputed domain names all redirected users to the competitive commercial website at the domain name <myadult.com>, which features adult entertainment content. The deliberate nature of the Respondent's scheme is also evidenced by the fact that he planned and executed the registration of 10 different variations of the trademark on the same day. The Respondent's conduct can be readily characterized as an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, constituting bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

In addition, the Complainant has adduced evidence showing a pattern of bad faith registrations by the Respondent in connection with other infringing domain names, all of which feature typo-squatting. See for example the decisions condemning the conduct of the Respondent in *CC Network Limited v. Zhichao Yang*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4013](#) and *Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Zhichao Yang*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-4377](#).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <fanaonly.com>, <fandsonly.com>, <fanysonly.com>, <onlybfans.com>, <onlycfans.com>, <onlyhfans.com>, <onlyrfans.com>, <onlysfana.com>, <onlysfand.com>, <onlyufans.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christopher J. Pibus/

Christopher J. Pibus

Sole Panelist

Date: May 5, 2025