

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Roger Rodrigues,
Calcinha Molhada
Case No. D2025-1664

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Roger Rodrigues, Calcinha Molhada, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <packonlyfansgratis.blog>, <pornoonlyfans.blog>, <pornoonlyfansgratis.blog> and <xvideonlyfansgratis.blog> are 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 24, 2025. On April 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 25, 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 28, 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 29, 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 May 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 owns and operates the website located at the domain <onlyfans.com> and has used its domain name for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web. In providing its services, the Complainant has made extensive use of the ONLYFANS trademark. The Complainant has registered rights in the Marks with the European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”), the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (“UKIPO”), and the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), and the Complainant has developed extensive common law rights throughout the world.

In the European Union and United Kingdom, the Complainant has registrations in multiple classes for the ONLYFANS word and design marks. In the United States, the Complainant has registrations for the ONLYFANS, ONLYFANS.COM, and OFTV word marks in various classes (“Word Mark(s)” and the lock logo and OF design marks (“Logo(s)” (collectively, the “Marks”). The Complainant also holds International Registrations on the word and design marks under the Madrid Protocol, and the Complainant has pursued registrations across the world in numerous jurisdictions, including Brazil. The Complainant’s earliest registered rights accrued under EUIPO registration number 017912377 for ONLYFANS which was registered on January 9, 2019.

The registration dates of the disputed domain names are as follows: <packonlyfansgratis.blog> was registered on October 8, 2024; <pornoonlyfans.blog> was registered on October 8, 2024; <pornoonlyfansgratis.blog> was registered on October 8, 2024; and <xvideonlyfansgratis.blog> was registered on September 25, 2024. The disputed domain names resolve to websites that offer 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names on September 25 and October 8, 2024. The Complainant has had registered rights in the Marks as early as June 5, 2018, and the Complainant has used the Marks since at least June 4, 2016. Further, the Complainant’s common law rights have been recognized by an earlier UDRP panel as having acquired distinctiveness by at least July 4, 2016. See *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Admin, Beacons AI Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0113](#). Thus, the Complainant’s rights pre-date the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain names.

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 names or in any other manner. The Respondent uses the disputed domain names 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 names.

The disputed domain names consist of the Complainant's exact ONLYFANS Mark with the only difference being the insertion of the descriptive terms "gratis" ("free"), "pack" and/or "porno" around the Complainant's Mark, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that its ONYFANS trademark is well recognized and registered years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain names. The Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain names to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant's site to commercial websites that offer 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 names. 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 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "gratis" "porno", "pack", and "xvideos", 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 names 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 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.

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 websites at the disputed domain names feature that trademark while offering services competing with the Complainant's. Consequently, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its ONLYFANS trademark.

The Panel finds that the Respondent uses the disputed domain names 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 names were registered and are 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 names <packonlyfansgratis.blog>, <pornoonlyfans.blog>, <pornoonlyfansgratis.blog> and <xvideosonlyfansgratis.blog> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez /

Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez

Sole Panelist

Date: June 27, 2025