

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. bilal jakrta, Hella
Case No. D2025-2509

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is bilal jakrta, Hella, United States Minor Outlying Islands.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <onlyfans-a.com>, <onlyfans-a.online>, and <onlyfans-b.com> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 25, 2025. On June 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 26, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (“Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0173805193”, “Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0173805194”, and “Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0173805202”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 27, 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 June 27, 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 June 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 21, 2025.

The Center appointed R. Eric Gaum as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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

Complainant owns and operates the website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com> and has used its domain name for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web. In providing its services, Complainant has made extensive use of the ONLYFANS trademark.

In the European Union and United Kingdom, Complainant has registrations in multiple classes for the ONLYFANS word and design marks. In the United States, Complainant has registrations for the ONLYFANS, ONLYFANS.COM, and OFTV word marks in various classes (“Word Mark(s)”) and the lock logo and OF design marks (“Logo(s)”) (collectively, the “Marks”). For example, see the following trademark registrations:

- European Union Trademark Reg. No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS for use in connection with multiple goods and services (registered January 9, 2019);
- U.S. Reg. No. 5,769,267 for ONLYFANS for use in connection with “arranging subscriptions of the online publications of others” (registered June 4, 2019);
- U.S. Reg. No. 5,769,268 for ONLYFANS.COM for use in connection with “arranging subscriptions of the online publications of others” (registered June 4, 2019).

Complainant registered the <onlyfans.com> domain name on January 29, 2013.

The disputed domain names were all registered on January 14, 2025. According to Complainant, the websites at two of the disputed domain names offer adult entertainment services (including content pirated from Complainant’s users) in direct competition with Complainant’s services. The <onlyfans-a.com> disputed domain name does not resolve to a website.

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, Complainant contends the following:

The disputed domain names consist of Complainant’s exact Mark with the only difference being the insertion of “-a” or “-b” after Complainant’s Mark, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity. The use of the “.com” and “.online” generic Top Level Domains (“gTLDs”) does not affect the finding of confusing similarity. Even more so, two of the disputed domain names use “.com” which is identical to Complainant’s registration on the ONLYFANS.COM mark.

Respondent has no connection or affiliation with Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Marks in the disputed domain names or in any other manner. Respondent is not commonly known by the Marks and does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain names.

The Complainant “has achieved global fame and success in a short time” which makes it “clear [that] Respondent knew of Complainant’s Marks and knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name”. No evidence indicates that Respondent is known by the text of the disputed domain names, and the Panel should presume that Respondent is not known by the text of the disputed domain names.

Here, the websites at two of the disputed domain names offer adult entertainment services (including content pirated from Complainant’s users) in direct competition with Complainant’s services, including “providing entertainment services ... in the nature of a website featuring non-downloadable video, photographs, images, audio, and ... in the field of adult entertainment”. Using a disputed domain name to host commercial websites that advertise goods and services in direct competition with the trademark owner does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests.

Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names not because they refer to or is associated with Respondent, but because the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the <onlyfans.com> domain name and Marks used by Complainant in association with Complainant’s services.

From all available evidence, the disputed domain names were registered on January 14, 2025, long after Complainant attained registered rights in the Marks and long after Complainant had common law rights in the Marks which had acquired. Here, Respondent registered the confusingly similar disputed domain names to offer services in direct competition with Complainant (including content pirated from Complainant’s users), including “providing entertainment services ... in the nature of a website featuring non-downloadable video, photographs, images, audio, and ... in the field of adult entertainment”. This is especially true where the respondent pirates material from the complainant’s website, as is the case here.

Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent on April 1, 2025 demanding Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain names. Respondent did not respond, thus necessitating the filing of this Complaint. Respondent’s failure to respond to this correspondence is further evidence of bad faith.

Here, Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain names to divert Internet traffic from Complainant’s site to a website offering adult entertainment content (including content pirated from Complainant’s users) in direct competition with Complainant’s website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to 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 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.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. The addition of “-a” or “-b” is does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Furthermore, the gTLDs are disregarded. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1 (“The applicable Top Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.”). 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 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

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 Respondent registered the confusingly similar disputed domain names long after Complainant attained registered rights in its trademarks, Respondent failed to respond to a cease-and-desist letter from Complainant and defaulted in this proceeding, and that two of Respondent’s disputed domain names resolve to websites that offer adult entertainment services, including content pirated from Complainant’s users, in direct competition with Complainant’s services.

The disputed domain name <onlyfans-a.com> does not resolve to any active website, which does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of this case.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <onlyfans-a.com>, <onlyfans-a.online>, and <onlyfans-b.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/R. Eric Gaum/

R. Eric Gaum

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2025