

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. selva ragavan, ragavantech
Case No. D2025-2489

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is selva ragavan, ragavantech, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyefans.org> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 24, 2025. On June 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 25, 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 the same day.

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 June 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter Kružliak as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 operates a website providing adult content to 305 million registered users worldwide under the domain name <onlyfans.com>, which was originally registered on January 29, 2013.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following registered trademarks:

- European Union trademark registration no. 017912377 ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, for goods and services in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United States trademark registration no. 5769267 ONLYFANS, registered on June 4, 2019, for services in Class 35;
- International registration no. 1507723 ONLYFANS, registered on November 2, 2019, for goods and services in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42 designating more than 60 jurisdictions worldwide, including India.

(collectively the “ONLYFANS Trademark”)

The Complainant has also registered on November 2, 2019 a figurative International trademark, number 1509110 designating more than 60 jurisdictions worldwide, including India, of the following representation:



The disputed domain name was registered on February 11, 2025 and resolves to a website offering adult dating services. The website also prominently carries a logo that is identical to the logo of the Complainant registered as figurative International trademark. The Respondent failed to respond to cease-and-desist letter of the Complainant.

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 disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS Trademark. The disputed domain name consists of Complainant's exact trademark with the only difference being the insertion of the letter “e” within Complainant's trademark, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since:

- 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 Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the Complainant's trademark or the disputed domain name and does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name;
- using the disputed domain name to offer adult entertainment dating service, thus to host commercial website that advertises goods and services in competition with the trademark owner does not give rise

- to legitimate rights or interests;
- the Respondent is reproducing certain aspects of the Complainant's website, including the stylized OnlyFans logo and the OnlyFans splash screen when loading the home page at the disputed domain name, thereby creating a clear risk of implied affiliation.

The Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since:

- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant had established its trademark rights and the registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark, as is the case here, creates a presumption of bad faith;
- bad faith registration should be found, since it is more probable than not that the Respondent was fully aware of Complainant and its ONLYFANS mark at the time of registration, as the website features a logo that is identical to Complainant's ONLYFANS logo and figurative trademark. And finally the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent demanding the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name, to which the Respondent did not respond;
- bad faith use should be found, since the disputed domain name directs to a commercial website that offers adult entertainment content in direct competition with the Complainant's services, the website contains a logo that is similar to Complainant's ONLYFANS logo, the Respondent failed to reply to Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and also hid from the public behind a Whois privacy wall.

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

The ONLYFANS Trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, in which only the letter "e" is added between the words "only" and "fans". The addition of letter "e" amounts to clear case of typo-squatting, and as an obvious and possibly even intentional misspelling does not affect the finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The generic Top-Level Domain of the disputed domain name may be disregarded in determining identity and confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 available record does not show any trademark registrations or earlier relevant rights of the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name. According to the available record – not rebutted by the Respondent – the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent to use its ONLYFANS Trademark in the disputed domain name. There is also no indication of legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering adult entertainment. The Respondent’s use is therefore not a bona fide offering of goods or services, as the Respondent is using the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name and its website for the Respondent’s own benefit to offer competing or related goods or services without any authorization from the Complainant to do so.

Furthermore, the Respondent reproduced certain aspects of the Complainant’s website, specifically the OnlyFans splash screen when loading the home page and prominently placed the logo of the Complainant registered as figurative trademark at the Respondent’s website. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 first notes that the ONLYFANS Trademark is registered in many jurisdictions globally, enjoys significant reputation and is well-known, as recognized by numerous earlier UDRP panel decisions (see for instance *Fenix International Limited v. jakkree ten*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1893](#) or *Fenix International Limited v. punn pertorico*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1869](#)). Furthermore, based on the fact that the disputed domain name contains the ONLYFANS Trademark in its entirety, only with the addition of “e” between the words “only” and “fans”, and the logo used at the website is identical to the logo of the Complainant registered as a figurative trademark, it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s business and ONLYFANS trademark, which supports a finding of bad faith registration.

The Panel reiterates that the disputed domain name resolves to website offering adult entertainment, thus offering services in direct competition with those offered by the Complainant. In the Panel’s view the Respondent has therefore intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. Moreover, the Panel again points out to the fact that the Respondent reproduced certain aspects of the Complainant’s website, specifically the OnlyFans splash screen when loading the home page and

prominently placed the logo of the Complainant registered as figurative trademark at the Respondent's website. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as impersonation/passing off, also supports the finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy and 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 <onlyefans.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Kružliak/

Peter Kružliak

Sole Panelist

Date: August 14, 2025