

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Yaqoob Albultamori
Case No. D2025-1780

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Yaqoob Albultamori, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <safeonlyfans.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 2, 2025. On May 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Administrator) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on May 7, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 7, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 29, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on May 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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

Since 2016, Complainant has operated a website at <onlyfans.com> to host a platform for subscribers to view and post audiovisual content. The website states: "Sign up to support your favorite creators."

According to Complainant, the <onlyfans.com> website is one of the most popular websites in the world, and Complainant has 305 million subscribers. (It had at least 180 million subscribers by the time the Domain Name at issue in this proceeding was registered.) By one Internet ranking service, the site is ranked 97th in the world in 2024 in terms of traffic.

Complainant holds several registered trademarks for ONLYFANS or ONLYFANS.COM. For instance, Complainant holds with the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Reg. No. 5,769,267 for ONLYFANS, registered on June 4, 2019, for "arranging the subscriptions of the online publications of others," with a July 4, 2016 date of first use in commerce. Complainant also holds USPTO Reg. No. 5,769,268 for ONLYFANS.COM, registered on June 4, 2019, also for "arranging the subscriptions of the online publications of others," with a July 4, 2016 date of first use in commerce. Complainant also holds European Union Reg. No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019 in connection with, among other things, "online subscription services for the purpose of allowing individuals to subscribe and access content uploaded by members of the service for sporting, fitness and entertainment purposes."

The Domain Name was registered on November 16, 2024. The Domain Name resolves to a commercial website inviting visitors to "join now and create a safe community for your supporters"

On March 28, 2025, Complainant's counsel sent a cease-and-desist email to the Registrar (Respondent used a privacy service). Complainant received no response to this email.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent raised various points in his Response. The crux of Respondent's position is best reflected in the following statements from the Response:

"While the domain safeonlyfans.com contains the word 'onlyfans,' it is not identical or confusingly similar to the complainant's trademark. The addition of the term 'safe' serves as a significant modifier, clearly distinguishing the platform's focus. 'Safe' conveys the philosophy behind the business-offering a secure, non-explicit space for learning and mentorship. This is in stark contrast to the adult-content focus of the complainant's platform. [...]"

“The idea for SafeOnlyFans was conceived independently and has been under development for over a year. The name was chosen for branding purposes, reflecting a safe and secure environment for creators of educational content. I did not register the domain to target OnlyFans, capitalize on its traffic, or imitate its services. [...]”

“The domain is part of a broader vision: an educational platform where creators share knowledge-not adult content. The platform offers exclusive content for fans in areas such as finance, motivation, leadership, and lifestyle improvement. This business model has no overlap with the complainant’s business or target audience. [...]”

“My use of the domain has always been transparent, legitimate, and aligned with a long-term entrepreneurial effort. I have not attempted to divert traffic from OnlyFans or profit from its reputation. The sole purpose of this domain is to serve as the front-facing brand of a distinct educational platform.”

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Complainant’s trademark and the Domain Names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7.

The Panel concludes that Complainant has rights in the trademark ONLYFANS through extensive registration and use demonstrated in the record. The Panel also concludes that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to that mark. The Domain Name entirely incorporates the ONLYFANS mark and adds the word “safe”. The Panel concludes that the mark remains clearly recognizable within the Domain Name despite this additional word.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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 often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. Thus, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production 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.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in connection with the Domain Name. It is clear from this record that Respondent targeted Complainant’s mark. Complainant’s mark is well-known, and the services purportedly provided at the website to which the Domain Name resolves are similar to Complainant’s services. Even though Respondent professes to steer clear of “adult” content, both Parties’ sites solicit subscribers to view and post content for other subscribers. Further, not all the content at Complainant’s site is “adult” in nature. There is simply no getting around the fact that the Domain Name leads to a website offering similar services to Complainant’s services, and the conclusion that Respondent is free-riding on the renown of Complainant’s ONLYFANS mark is inescapable.

Finally, and this is a minor point here, Respondent apparently had the opportunity to explain its bona fides and urge its innocence upon receipt of Complainant’s cease-and-desist missive. It strikes the Panel as odd that a wholly legitimate party in Respondent’s position would not have availed himself of the opportunity to engage Complainant upon receipt of the cease-and-desist missive. Relatedly, Respondent claimed in his Response to have invested considerable time and resources to develop his business, but no corroborating evidence was provided with the Response. The foregoing considerations slightly reinforce the Panel’s conclusion that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, “in particular but without limitation,” are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in “bad faith”:

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on Respondent’s website or location.

The Panel concludes that Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith under the Policy. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the “Rights or Legitimate Interests” section. On this record, the Panel finds it clear that Respondent targeted Complainant’s mark when registering the Domain Name, and has used the Domain Name for illegitimate commercial gain by seeking to divert Internet traffic for commercial gain by free-riding on Complainant’s well-known mark. This constitutes bad faith registration and use within the meaning of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain name <safeonlyfans.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: May 21, 2025