

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Elkin Rios, reign
Case No. D2025-1722

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Elkin Rios, reign, Colombia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <modeloslivefansonly.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 29, 2025. On April 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 2, 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 (No Data Provided by Registrar) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 5, 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 May 5, 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 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any formal response.

Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 27, 2025.

The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on May 27, 2025 and June 3, 2025. On June 3, 2025, the proceedings were suspended until July 3, 2025, upon the Complainant's request. On July 3, 2025, the Respondent sent another email communication to the Center. The Center notified the Parties of reinstatement of the proceedings on the same date.

The Center appointed Petter Rindforth as the sole panelist in this matter on July 8, 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 is a United Kingdom based company, providing a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content, located at "www.onlyfans.com".

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for ONLYFANS, including but not limited to:

- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00917912377 ONLYFANS (word), registered January 9, 2019, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 5,769,268 ONLYFANS.COM (word), registered June 4, 2019, for services in International Class 35; and
- United States trademark registration No. 6,253,455 ONLYFANS (word), registered January 26, 2021, for goods and services in Intl Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was created on August 21, 2024, and resolves to an active website offering adult entertainment services.

No further information is available on the Respondent.

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 has registered trademark rights for ONLYFANS in a number of jurisdictions around the world, and the Complainant's domain name <onlyfans.com> is connected to the Complainant's website with more than 305 million users around the world.

The Complainant's trademark rights have been recognized in over one hundred and fifty other UDRP panel decisions, resulting in the cancellation or transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

The disputed domain name consists of a reversal of the Complainant's trademark with the insertion of the descriptive term "models" and "live" beforehand, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity.

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 trademarks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner.

The disputed domain name is registered and used in bad faith. The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on December 26, 2024, demanding the Respondent to stop using and cancel the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not respond, thus necessitating the filing of this Complaint. The Respondent's failure to respond to this correspondence is further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not substantively reply to the Complainant's contentions. In its email communications of May 27 and June 3, 2025, the Respondent indicated that it had taken down the website at the disputed domain name and expressed its willingness to transfer the disputed domain name, however, the Parties were unable to reach settlement.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, notwithstanding that the terms "fans" and "only" are interspersed in 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.

Further, although the addition of other terms (here, "modelos", "live") 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

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 the addition of the terms "modelos" and "live" related to the Complainant's business/services in the disputed domain name, coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to offer services in competition with the Complainant, using a logo similar to the Complainant's, albeit with the terms "fans" and "only" interspersed. The Panel finds that this affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

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 notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, by registering and using a confusingly similar disputed domain name, with the addition of terms related to the Complainant's business, for online services similar to the Complainant's services.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <modeloslivefansonly.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Petter Rindforth/

Petter Rindforth

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2025