

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Christopher Zane, Harold Allen, Cipta Sari
Case No. D2025-1492

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Christopher Zane, Hong Kong, China; Harold Allen, Hong Kong, China; and Cipta Sari, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <onlyfansaa.com>, <onlyfansan.com>, <onlyfansat.com>, <onlyfansbe.com>, <onlyfansbi.com>, <onlyfansby.com>, <onlyfansde.com>, <onlyfansdo.com>, <onlyfansen.com>, <onlyfansfe.com>, <onlyfansha.com>, <onlyfanshi.com>, <onlyfansho.com>, <onlyfansid.com>, <onlyfansif.com>, <onlyfansis.com>, <onlyfansjo.com>, <onlyfanska.com>, <onlyfanski.com>, <onlyfanslo.com>, <onlyfansma.com>, <onlyfansmi.com>, <onlyfansmm.com>, <onlyfansno.com>, <onlyfansnu.com>, <onlyfansof.com>, <onlyfansok.com>, <onlyfansop.com>, <onlyfansor.com>, <onlyfansox.com>, <onlyfansoy.com>, <onlyfanspa.com>, <onlyfanspi.com>, <onlyfansqi.com>, <onlyfanssh.com>, <onlyfanssi.com>, <onlyfansso.com>, <onlyfansta.com>, <onlyfansto.com>, <onlyfansuh.com>, <onlyfansun.com>, <onlyfansut.com>, <onlyfanswe.com>, <onlyfanswo.com>, <onlyfansxu.com>, <onlyfansya.com>, <onlyfansye.com>, <onlyfansyo.com>, <onlyfansza.com> and <onlyfanszo.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 10, 2025. On April 14 and 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 14 and 24, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 25, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are

under common control. The Complainant filed the first amended Complaint on April 25, 2025, and filed the second amended Complaint on April 29, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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 in this administrative proceeding owns and operates the website located at "www.onlyfans.com", which it has been using in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the Internet.

In 2025 the website is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

The corresponding domain name <onlyfans.com> was registered on January 29, 2013.

The Complainant is among others owner of the International Trademark Registration No. 1507723 for the word mark ONLYFANS registered on November 2, 2019.

The trademark is registered in over 50 jurisdictions for among others online subscription services for the purpose of allowing individuals to subscribe and access content uploaded by members of the service for entertainment purposes.

The disputed domain names were registered between March 13, 2024 and June 29, 2024 and (except for the disputed domain name <onlyfanswe.com> have been resolving to identically or similarly looking websites offering adult entertainment services in competition with the Complainant's services.

As regard use of the disputed domain name <onlyfanswe.com> for which there is no evidence in the record and which is currently inactive the Panel applied its rights articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and consulted the Internet Archive at "www.web.archive.org". An April 13, 2024 capture by the Wayback Machine shows that the disputed domain name <onlyfanswe.com> also resolved to a website offering adult entertainment services in competition with the Complainant's 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- the disputed domain names that incorporate the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark in full with the addition of random two-letter terms are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark;
- the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since they are unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy;
- due to the international widespread recognition of the Complainant's trademark amongst the relevant public the Respondents either knew or should have known the trademark and have likely registered the disputed domain names to target the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred from the Respondents to the Complainant.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the complaint, namely that:

- (i) the domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain names; and
- (iii) the domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to 50 domain names registered by three different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are either the same person of somehow connected to each other and are under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards to common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names are registered with the same Registrar; the Respondents all target the Complainant and its trademark; the structure of the disputed domain names (the ONLYFANS mark plus random two-letter terms such as: "aa", "an", "at", "be", "bi" etc.) is identical and the disputed domain names resolve to webpages with identical or similar layout.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) 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 names. [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 that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

The trademark is fully reproduced within the disputed domain names. Although the addition of other, in this case random two-letter terms) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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.

Based on the available record, the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent to use its ONLYFANS trademark in the disputed domain names or in any other way that would confer validity or legitimacy upon such use.

The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names that incorporate the Complainant’s trademark in full to redirect users to websites offering services in competition with the Complainant does not amount to use for a bona fide offering of goods and services and cannot create rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3.

The Panel finds that 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 a basic Internet search for the ONLYFANS trademark returns solely the Complainant's business.

Previous UDRP panels have established that the Complainant's trademark and its activities are "internationally well-known amongst the relevant public". *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#).

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.

The above facts, coupled with an absence of the Respondent's explanation for its inclusion of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain names and using it for website offering competing services to those of the Complainant in view of the Panel show that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademark and registered the disputed domain names to trade on the goodwill attached to it.

Also, the Respondent's websites at the disputed domain names offering adult entertainment video services in direct competition with the Complainant is evidence of use of the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name <onlyfanswe.com> at the time of rendering of the Decision did not resolve to an active website does not alter the Panel's conclusion.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

In this context the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition and previous use of the disputed domain name and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <onlyfansaa.com>, <onlyfansan.com>, <onlyfansat.com>, <onlyfansbe.com>, <onlyfansbi.com>, <onlyfansby.com>, <onlyfansde.com>, <onlyfansdo.com>, <onlyfansen.com>, <onlyfansfe.com>, <onlyfansha.com>, <onlyfanshi.com>, <onlyfansho.com>, <onlyfansid.com>, <onlyfansif.com>, <onlyfansis.com>, <onlyfansjo.com>, <onlyfanska.com>, <onlyfanski.com>, <onlyfanslo.com>, <onlyfansma.com>, <onlyfansmi.com>, <onlyfansmm.com>, <onlyfansno.com>, <onlyfansnu.com>, <onlyfansof.com>, <onlyfansok.com>, <onlyfansop.com>, <onlyfansor.com>, <onlyfansox.com>, <onlyfansoy.com>, <onlyfanspa.com>, <onlyfanspi.com>, <onlyfansqi.com>, <onlyfanssh.com>, <onlyfanssi.com>, <onlyfansso.com>, <onlyfansta.com>, <onlyfansto.com>, <onlyfansuh.com>, <onlyfansun.com>, <onlyfansut.com>, <onlyfanswe.com>,

<onlyfanswo.com>, <onlyfansxu.com>, <onlyfansya.com>, <onlyfansye.com>, <onlyfansyo.com>, <onlyfansza.com> and <onlyfanszo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: June 27, 2025