

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. jason cardiff
Case No. D2025-2547

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group, United States.

The Respondent is jason cardiff, Ireland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfandate.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 30, 2025. On July 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 1, 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 (“Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC / DomainsByProxy.com”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 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 July 2, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 24, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on July 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Yuri Chumak as the sole panelist in this matter on July 31, 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, owns and operates the widely known website <onlyfans.com>. The Complainant's platform is a subscription-based social media service that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content. The Complainant has operated this platform for several years and has garnered significant global recognition, including over 300 million registered users as of 2025. The <onlyfans.com> domain was registered on January 29, 2013, and is the primary platform through which the Complainant provides its services.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for ONLYFANS in multiple jurisdictions, including the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and through international instruments such as the Madrid Protocol, including the following registrations:

1. European Union Intellectual Property Office Reg. No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019;
2. United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office Reg. No. 00917912377, registered on January 9, 2019;
3. United States Patent and Trademark Office Reg. No. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019.

In addition to its registered rights, the Complainant has developed common law trademark rights in the ONLYFANS mark through use since at least July 4, 2016.

The Complainant has been involved in over 150 previous UDRP proceedings, resulting in the cancellation or transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant. Prior UDRP panels have acknowledged the mark as being "internationally well-known amongst the relevant public" (*Fenix International Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#) (March 15, 2021)).

The disputed domain name, <onlyfandate.com>, was registered on December 17, 2024, via GoDaddy.com, LLC, a US-based domain registrar. According to the public WHOIS, the registrant used a privacy service, and the disputed domain name initially resolved to a website that redirected to a dating platform.

The Respondent is Jason Cardiff, who submitted a formal response ("Response") identifying himself as the founder and director of a limited liability company incorporated in Ireland.

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.

In particular, the Complainant contends that:

1. The disputed domain name <onlyfandate.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark. The addition of the word "date" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized any use of its marks, and the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that redirecting to a commercial dating website constitutes neither a bona fide offering of goods/services nor a fair use.

3. The Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith by intentionally targeting the Complainant's well-known mark to divert Internet users for commercial gain. The Complainant also relies on the Respondent's use of a privacy service and the lack of response to its June 14, 2025 cease-and-desist letter as further indicia of bad faith.

The Complainant seeks transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent, Jason Cardiff, contends that the disputed domain name was registered on December 17, 2024, via GoDaddy.com, LLC, for use in a legitimate business venture, namely, the development of "OnlyFanDate", an AI-powered romantic matchmaking platform operated by an Irish company under his direction.

The Respondent maintains that the name refers to exclusivity in romantic admiration, not the Complainant's brand. He states that the disputed domain name was selected after internal brand development and due diligence, and denies any intent to target or capitalize on the Complainant's mark.

According to the Respondent, the OnlyFanDate platform is distinct in both concept and execution from the Complainant's subscription-based content service. The Respondent distinguishes the proposed service as a dating platform and denies any overlap with the Complainant's mark in commercial impression, business model, or user expectations.

The Respondent further states that the temporary redirect of the disputed domain name was part of a development-stage rollout and did not involve monetization of the Complainant's mark. He denies any effort to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or to mislead users, and notes that no confusion or complaints have arisen.

The Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied and that the Panel enter a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking under section 15(e) of the Rules, asserting that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and lacks evidentiary support.

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant has established registered rights in the mark ONLYFANS through multiple trademark registrations, as well as international registrations and extensive use in commerce since at least 2016. Prior UDRP panels have recognized the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark as being well-known and widely associated with its online subscription-based platform.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “date”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The disputed domain name incorporates a near-verbatim reproduction of the Complainant’s mark, omitting only the final “s” in “ONLYFANS”, and appends the term “date”. The Panel notes that prior decisions have found minor typographical alterations, such as the omission of a single character, insufficient to dispel confusing similarity where the dominant element remains recognizable. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel finds that “onlyfan” remains recognizably similar to “ONLYFANS” and that the addition of “date”, a term descriptive of online interaction and relationships, does not dispel the overall impression of association with the Complainant’s mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

The Complainant has made out a detailed prima facie case: it has shown (i) the strength and fame of the ONLYFANS mark; (ii) the absence of any licence or consent; and (iii) that the disputed domain name is being used to divert traffic. As is reflected in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1, the burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent.

The Respondent claims that “OnlyFanDate” is a new AI-based dating venture unrelated to the Complainant and that the parties operate in different sectors. This argument is either disingenuous or at best misplaced. The Respondent uses the Complainant’s mark to draw users to his own “realtruedate” adult-dating site; this conduct constitutes a clear case of bad faith misappropriation of the reputation and good will of another and plainly does not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests under the Policy or otherwise.

The use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered legitimate non-commercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The site is plainly commercial and appears designed to monetize traffic attracted by the Complainant’s mark.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has failed to rebut that case.

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 this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has “intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [its] website... by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark” within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant’s ONLYFANS mark is distinctive and well-known in connection with its widely used content subscription platform. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in December 2024, at a time when the Complainant’s mark had long been the subject of extensive press, high-profile enforcement, and over 150 prior UDRP proceedings, all of which underscore its global notoriety. The Respondent does not deny knowledge of the Complainant or its mark. Indeed, his own Response attempts to differentiate his intended offering from the Complainant’s platform, which only further confirms his awareness of the Complainant and its mark at the time of registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The disputed domain incorporates the Complainant’s mark with only a minor typographical alteration (dropping the plural “s”) and the addition of a descriptive term (“date”), producing a domain name that closely resembles, and may plausibly be mistaken for, an official offshoot of the Complainant’s platform.

The Respondent’s actual use of the disputed domain name reinforces this finding. At all material times, the disputed domain name redirected to a dating website that makes no mention of the asserted “OnlyFanDate” platform. This points to an opportunistic registration intended to exploit the Complainant’s reputation. The Respondent has provided no contemporaneous evidence of a bona fide business or credible plans for independent branding linked to the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The use of a privacy service, though not inherently problematic, may, in appropriate circumstances, reinforce a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.6. In this case, the Respondent used a privacy service and failed to respond to the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter sent on June 14, 2025. The Respondent came forward only after these proceedings were formally initiated. Viewed cumulatively, this conduct supports the inference that the privacy service was used to delay disclosure and avoid accountability.

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 name <onlyfandate.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuri Chumak/

Yuri Chumak

Sole Panelist

Date: August 13, 2025