

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. aye khaing
Case No. D2025-2571

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is aye khaing, Thailand.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <onlyfanthai.com> and <onlyfan4u.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 1, 2025. On July 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 2, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 3, 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 July 9, 2025.

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 July 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 31, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Moonchul Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on August 7, 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 provides social media platform services which allow users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content, including adult entertainment content, on the Internet, under the name “onlyfans” and via the domain name <onlyfans.com>. The Complainant registered the domain name <onlyfans.com> in 2013.

The Complainant owns the trademarks ONLYFANS and ONLYFANS.COM, which were registered in numerous jurisdictions including as follows:

- European Union Trade Mark for ONLYFANS, No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019;
- United States Registration for ONLYFANS, No. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019; and
- United States Registration for ONLYFANS.COM, No. 5769268, registered on June 4, 2019.

The disputed domain names were registered on March 7, 2025. They have resolved to websites offering adult entertainment content, featuring non-downloadable video and photographs.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that:

- (a) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, ONLYFANS and ONLYFANS.COM;
- (b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and
- (c) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names, primarily for the purpose of obtaining benefits commercially from the confusion of Internet users that visit the site by mistake. In addition, the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of bad faith, as evidenced by previous UDRP cases.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must demonstrate that the three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. These elements are that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark or service mark; (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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain names consist of the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark omitting the letter “s” and adding the descriptive terms “thai” or “4u”.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1). 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 names. ([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 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 Panel finds that the addition of the descriptive terms "thai" or "4u" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the respective disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8).

In addition, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element test. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the overall burden of proof is on the Complainant. However, once the Complainant presents a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, the burden of production of evidence shifts to the Respondent. ([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.

Firstly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's contention 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. 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.

Secondly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Panel considers that the disputed domain names comprising the Complainant's trademark plus additional terms such as "thai" or "4u", cannot constitute fair use, since it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1). Especially, in this case both of the disputed domain names have resolved to websites offering adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant's services, which carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names under the circumstances of this case. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4).

Thirdly, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. In the consideration of the above circumstances the Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case and the Respondent failed to come forward with any appropriate evidence that might rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the disputed domain names have "been registered and [are] being used in bad faith". Thus, for the Complainant to succeed, a UDRP panel must be satisfied that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. These requirements are conjunctive; each must be proven or the Complaint fails. In addition, 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).

Firstly, the Complainant obtained the registration of trademark much earlier than the Respondents registered the disputed domain names. Having noted the composition of the disputed domain names which includes the Complainant's trademark and the websites featuring a logo that is similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS logo, it is highly likely that the Respondent has been aware of the Complainant's trademark and its goods or services. Thus, the Panel considers that the Respondent deliberately chose the disputed domain names and registered them in bad faith.

Secondly, as earlier mentioned, the disputed domain names of the Respondent have resolved to websites offering adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant's services. In this circumstance the Panel considers that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names, primarily for the purpose of obtaining the commercial benefits from the confusion of Internet users that visited the site by mistake as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Thirdly, having reviewed the evidence the Complainant provided, the Panel notes that the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of bad faith as a serial cybersquatting, targeting at the same trademark's owner of the Complainant. The Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the domain names constitutes the pattern of bad faith conduct. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied 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 <onlyfanthai.com> and <onlyfan4u.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Moonchul Chang/

Moonchul Chang

Sole Panelist

Date: August 21, 2025