

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. li lu
Case No. D2025-1690

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fenix International Limited c/o United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is li lu, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansx.cfd> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 25, 2025. On April 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 29, 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 Purposes) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 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 Dietrich Beier 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 owns and operates the website under the domain name <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 adult content on the World Wide Web. In 2025, Complainant's website at <onlyfans.com> is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users. Such website of the Complainant shows also a stylised word device logo "OF" in blue/white.

The Complainant is the proprietor of several trademark registrations for ONLYFANS, among them the European Union Trademark Registration No. 017946559 ONLYFANS (Word device, with the element "Fans" in blue) as well as the European Union word Trademark Registration No.017912377 ONLYFANS, both registered on January 9, 2019, in several classes, 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42, being in effect.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 21, 2024.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website with adult content under the name "onlyFans" with a red "X" in the background and accompanied by a blue logo "OF" highly similar to the one of the Complainant. The Respondent did not reply to a cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant before the Complaint had been filed.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that its trademark ONLYFANS is distinctive and that it owns a large portfolio of registered trademarks for it.

The disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant's ONLYFANS marks, differing only by the addition of the letter X which does not distinguish the disputed domain name from Complainant's marks.

Further, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name nor was authorized by the Complainant to make use of its mark.

The intent to confuse Internet users is also evident from the Respondent's use of the Complainant's logo on the website associated with the disputed domain name.

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 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark 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. The addition of the letter “x” at the end of the Second Level Domain 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

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 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 notes that the Complainant did not grant any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks. Furthermore, there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “onlyfansx”. The use of the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name for offering adult entertainment operating in the same industry as the Complainant does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Due to the success of the Complainant and the amount of registered users as well as using the a highly similar logo on the website of the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name (see also the Panel’s conclusion on the Complainant’s being well-known and the list of related panel decisions in *Fenix International Limited v. Michał Prątnicki, INVERTED8 SP. Z O.O.* WIPO Case No. D2025-0744).

The Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to make use of its mark. The Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this disputed domain name without the Complainant’s authorization.

The circumstances of this case, including the use of a highly similar logo on the website associated with the disputed domain name and the use of the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name itself further indicate, in the Panel’s view, that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name primarily with the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or of a product or service on such website. The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 name <onlyfansx.cfd> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dietrich Beier/

Dietrich Beier

Sole Panelist

Date: June 10, 2025