

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Ivan Ivanov
Case No. D2025-2333

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 Ivan Ivanov, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <only-fans.mom> is registered with Registrar of Domain Names REG. RU LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 13, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 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 / Personal data, can not be disclosed according to applicable laws) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 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 amended Complaint on June 23, 2025.


On June 17, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. On June 23, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in English and Russian the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on July 18, 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 registered in the United Kingdom. It is a subscription-based video-on-demand service and social media network operating under the brand ONLYFANS and under the logo .

The Complainant acts as a video hosting service, allowing content creators to upload videos and garner subscribers to their content, and provides its services through the website at the domain name <onlyfans.com> registered on January 29, 2013.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for ONLYFANS (the "ONLYFANS Trademark"):

- the European Union trademark ONLYFANS with registration No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42;
- the United States Trademark ONLYFANS with registration No. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019, for services in International Class 35;
- the United States Trademark ONLYFANS.COM with registration No. 5769268, registered on June 4, 2019, for services in International Class 35; and
- the International Trademark ONLYFANS with registration No. 1507723, registered on November 2, 2019 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42 for multiple jurisdictions, including the Russian Federation, where the Respondent is located.

The Complainant is also the owner of the United States figurative trademark  with registration No. 6938572, registered on January 3, 2023, for services in International Classes 38, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 18, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to an English language website with the page title "OnlyFans", which displayed the Complainant's logo  and copied the design of the Complainant's website, invited visitors to sign up with the text "Sign up to support your favorite authors", and included multiple posts by an entity with the username "OnlyFans" (combined with the Complainant's figurative OF trademark and followed by a "verified profile" checkmark) and with the handle "@onlyfans". The disputed domain name is currently blocked by Internet browsers, which display the page title "Reported Unsafe Site: Navigation Blocked", and the message "This site has been reported as unsafe".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its ONLYFANS Trademark, because it fully incorporates it with a dash between "only" and "fans".

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it has no connection with the Complainant, has not been authorized to use the ONLYFANS Trademark, is not commonly known under the disputed domain name, and has no relevant trademarks.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark to attract Internet users to a website that is a copy of the Complainant's website, so they may be misled into thinking that the Respondent's website is related to or even operated by the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the Respondent might also be attempting to harvest login credentials under the guise of logging into the official OnlyFans platform, which would represent a phishing activity.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It notes that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant registered the ONLYFANS Trademark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent was fully aware of this trademark when registering the disputed domain name, and this knowledge is evident from the design and content of the website at the disputed domain name, which copies the Complainant's website and contains its trademark and logo. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant's website to a lookalike website designed to trick users into providing various account login credentials.

The Complainant notes that it sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on April 7, 2025, but the Respondent did not respond.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue – Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requests that the language of the proceedings be English and claims that the Respondent is capable of reading and writing in English because the website at the disputed domain name is an English language copy of the Complainant's official OnlyFans website, which is also in English, and the disputed domain name is constructed of the English words "only" and "fans". The Complainant adds that substantial additional expense and delay are likely to be incurred if the Complaint has to be submitted in Russian.

The Respondent has not objected to the Complainant's language request and has not made any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ONLYFANS Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the ONLYFANS Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, while the ".mom" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") can be disregarded. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.9 and 1.11.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests and Bad Faith

The Panel considers that the facts and circumstances of this case would benefit from a joint discussion of the second and third UDRP elements. See section 2.15 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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, and has not provided any reasons for regarding its conduct as being carried out in good faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activities (here, claimed phishing, and impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1), and constitutes bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4).

Here, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, uses the ".mom" TLD and is overall nearly identical to the Complainant's official domain name <onlyfans.com> for its OnlyFans video-on-demand service and social media network, and the Respondent has used it for a website which is designed to impersonate the Complainant and the official OnlyFans service, and which invites visitors to log into it by providing their login credentials. Internet users wishing to access and use the Complainant's

services may be misled and attracted to the Respondent's website and may submit their login credentials in the mistaken belief that they are interacting with the Complainant's official website and are accessing its services. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name, and constitutes registration and use in bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the second and the third elements of the Policy have 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 name <only-fans.mom> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2025