

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Jorge Dyson
Case No. D2025-1620

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jorge Dyson, Portugal.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansleaksfree.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC, (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 22, 2025. On April 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 23, 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 (Registration Private, DomainsByProxy.com / Domains By Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 25, 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 April 25, 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 April 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez as the sole panelist in this matter on May 28, 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 operates the webpage “www.onlyfans.com”, an online social media platform allowing fans to subscribe to a wide variety of content creators. The Complainant has spent several years and a great amount of resources and manpower developing and maintaining its web presence and corporate image. The Complainant owns trademark registrations including ONLYFANS.COM, ONLYFANS, and OFTV word marks and the ONLYFANS and OF design marks in the European Union, United Kingdom, the United States, and numerous other jurisdictions. (See e.g., European Union Trademark No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, United Kingdom Trademark No. UK00003738190 for OF ONLYFANS, registered on April 1, 2022, United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) Registration No. 88173573, for ONLYFANS.COM, registered on June 4, 2019, and USPTO Registration No. 6918293, for OF, registered on December 6, 2022).

The disputed domain name <onlyfansleaksfree.com> was registered on October 8, 2024, and resolves to a website that displays the Complainant’s trademark and offers goods and services in direct competition with the Complainant.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ONLYFANS trademark with the only difference being the addition of the terms “leaks” and “free”, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity.

Further, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the ONLYFANS trademarks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to host commercial websites that advertise goods and services in direct competition with the Complainant, which does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests. In addition, there is no evidence that indicates that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that its ONLYFANS trademark is well recognized and registered years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant’s site to a commercial website that offers goods and services in direct competition with the Complainant’s website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and 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 Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "leaks" and "free", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1, a Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Once such prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the UDRP.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant nor authorized by the Complainant in any way to use its ONLYFANS trademark in a domain name. The Respondent does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Complainant.

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 the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark is widely known, and the website at the disputed domain name features that trademark while offering services competing with the Complainant's. Consequently, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its ONLYFANS trademark.

The Panel finds that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website and services purportedly advertised therein.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The third element 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 <onlyfansleaksfree.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez /

Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez

Sole Panelist

Date: June 11, 2025