

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. jakkree ten  
Case No. D2025-1893

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is jakkree ten, Thailand.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <deerlongonlyfans.com> and <onlyfanmickeemouse.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 12, 2025. On May 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <onlyfanmickeemouse.com>. On May 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <onlyfanmickeemouse.com> which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Administrator) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 15, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar for the disputed domain name <onlyfanmickeemouse.com>, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant requested a consolidation of proceedings on May 15, 2025, to include the disputed domain name <deerlongonlyfans.com>. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 22, 2025. On May 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <deerlongonlyfans.com>. On May 26, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <deerlongonlyfans.com>.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Ahmet Akgüloğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on June 24, 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, Fenix International Limited, is an online video platform company that owns and operates OnlyFans, which is an adult subscription content platform.

The Complainant is the owner of the ONLYFANS, ONLYFANS.COM and OFTV trademarks in several jurisdictions such as the United States, the European Union and the United Kingdom. Trademarks numbered 017912377 and 017946559 both registered on January 9, 2019 in the European Union Intellectual Property Office; trademarks numbered UK00917912377 and UK00917946559 both registered on January 9, 2019, in the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office; trademarks numbered 5769267 and 5769268, both registered on June 4, 2019, and trademark numbered 6918292, registered on December 6, 2022, in the United States Patent and Trademark Office; are some of the Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant also holds International registrations of ONLYFANS trademark with the international registration numbers 1507723 and 1509110 registered on November 2, 2019, in numerous countries.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <onlyfans.com> since January 29, 2013.

It has been understood that the Complainant has requested the consolidation of proceedings regarding the disputed domain names <deerlongonlyfans.com> and <onlyfanmickeemouse.com> claiming that the registrants of the disputed domain names are the same. The disputed domain name <deerlongonlyfans.com> was registered on December 9, 2024, and <onlyfanmickeemouse.com> was registered on December 22, 2024.

The disputed domain names resolve to webpages offering adult entertainment content, including watermarked content pirated from Complainant's users.

#### **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;

(a) The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its ONLYFANS trademark since they contain the word "onlyfans". The Complainant explains that the disputed domain name <deerlongonlyfans.com> consists of the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark with the only difference being the addition of "deerlong" which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity. Again, the Complainant explains that the disputed domain name <onlyfanmickeemouse.com> consists of the singular form of the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark, with the only difference being the addition of "mickee mouse", a

misspelled version of the third-party trademark “Mickey Mouse”, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity. The Complainant also asserts that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) extension “.com” does not affect the assessment of similarity.

(b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant submits that it has never granted the Respondent authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the trademarks in the disputed domain names or in any other manner and the Respondent is not commonly known by the trademarks. The Complainant also contends that, having made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts to the Respondent to provide concrete evidence that it has rights to, or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names and the Respondent will be unable to do so. The Complainant also asserts that the disputed domain names offer adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant’s services and it does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests.

(c) The disputed domain names were registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that its ONLYFANS trademark is well known and this is accepted by the previous UDRP panels. Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names after the registration dates of the Complainant’s well-known ONLYFANS trademarks. In this regard, it is unlikely that the Respondent did not know about the Complainant’s trademarks. Also, the Complainant underlines that the disputed domain names resolve to webpages that offer adult entertainment content, and it is clear that the Respondent uses these webpages in direct competition with the Complainant. Therefore, the Complainant uses the disputed domain names to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks. Additionally, the Complainant states that the Respondent is trying to conceal its identity with a Whois privacy wall, and the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter, which are all indications of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in this proceeding.

### **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. It is uncontested to the Panel that the Complainant has rights to ONLYFANS trademark as a result of their registrations in different jurisdictions.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

The disputed domain name <deerlongonlyfans.com> is composed of “deerlong”, “onlyfans” and “.com”. Likewise, the disputed domain name <onlyfanmickeemouse.com> is composed of “onlyfan”, “mickeemouse” and “.com”. The disputed domain name <deerlongonlyfans.com> incorporates the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark in its entirety. When a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant’s registered trademark that is sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy. The disputed domain name <onlyfanmickeemouse.com> consists of a misspelling of the Complainant’s ONLYFANS registered trademark, excluding the letter “s”, which is confusingly similar to the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel disregards the term “deerlong” in the disputed domain name <deerlongonlyfans.com> as the Complainant’s trademark remains recognizable. UDRP Panels have consistently found that the addition of other terms to a mark - whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise - will not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element (See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)). Similarly, the Panel also disregards the term “mickeemouse” in the disputed domain name <onlyfanmickeemouse.com>.

The Panel also ignored the gTLD extension “.com” since it is viewed as a standard registration requirement and suggested as disregarded under the first element similarity test (See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1).

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 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.

It is accepted by the Panel that the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use of their ONLYFANS trademark. The Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names and the Respondent has not submitted any evidence to the contrary.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or a bona fide offering of goods and services. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names for websites offering services in direct competition with the services offered by the Complainant and its users does not amount to use for a bona fide offering of goods and services.

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 registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, since the well-known status of the ONLYFANS trademark is proven by previous UDRP decisions (See *Fenix International Limited v. punn pertorico*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1869](#)) and it is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the ONLYFANS trademark at the time of registration. The Respondent chose to register the disputed domain names despite being aware of the Complainant's well-known trademark, thereby acting in bad faith. The Respondent intends to deceive Internet users for commercial gain by using the well-known status of the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the Panel agrees that the Respondent is still using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

The Respondent's websites offer adult entertainment video services in direct competition with the Complainant. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Considering the above, it is clear that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith to take advantage of the Complainant's well-known trademark.

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 names <deerlongonlyfans.com> and <onlyfanmickeemouse.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ahmet Akgüloğlu/

**Ahmet Akgüloğlu**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 7, 2025