

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Denis Semin
Case No. D2025-3235

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Denis Semin, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vip-onlyfans.online> 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 August 12, 2025. On August 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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 cannot be publicly disclosed according to applicable laws) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On August 14, 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 August 19, 2025, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint confirming its request that English be the language of the proceedings.

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 in English and Russian of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. The Response was filed in Russian with the Center on September 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Alissia Shchichka as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 owns and operates the commercial website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com>, which it has used 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 Internet. According to the Complainant, in 2025, its website ranks among the most popular websites worldwide, with more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant has evidenced to be the registered owner of numerous trademark registrations for ONLYFANS, including, but not limited to, the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration for ONLYFANS No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019, for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Registration for ONLYFANS No. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019, for services in class 35; and
- USPTO Registration No. 6253455 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 26, 2021, for goods in international classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The aforementioned trademarks and domain name were registered prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, which was registered on March 14, 2025.

Evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name initially redirected Internet visitors to various third-party websites with at least some offering adult entertainment and dating services similar to those of the Complainant. At present, the disputed domain name redirects to "www.google.com".

According to the disclosed Whois information, the Respondent is located in the Russian Federation.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademarks, as it wholly incorporates the trademark. The addition of the term "vip", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, since the Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Complainant further notes that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".online" should be disregarded for the purposes of the first element, as it is a standard registration requirement and does not affect the assessment of confusing similarity.

The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for the following reasons: (i) the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with, and has not received any authorization, license, or consent from, the Complainant to use the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademarks in connection with the disputed domain name; (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and does not hold any relevant trademark rights; (iii) the disputed domain name includes the Complainant's trademark together with the term "vip" which falsely suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant and creates a misleading impression of an official or "exclusive" OnlyFans experience; (iv) the disputed domain name redirected users to various websites offering competing adult entertainment dating services that are unrelated to the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. In particular: (i) the composition of the disputed domain name itself, which incorporates the Complainant's well-known ONLYFANS trademark together with the term "vip" demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration and intended to enhance the likelihood of confusion by suggesting sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant; (ii) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the well-known ONLYFANS trademark, creating a presumption of bad faith; (iii) the disputed domain name redirected users to commercial websites offering adult entertainment dating services in direct competition with the Complainant's services, thereby attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation, or endorsement; (iv) the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and used a privacy shield to conceal its identity, which constitutes additional evidence of bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent submits that the registration and use of the disputed domain name were conducted in good faith and without infringing the Complainant's rights. The Respondent notes that the Complaint was submitted in a language other than Russian, which complicated a full and precise understanding of the allegations; nevertheless, the Respondent reviewed the substance of the Complaint based on the information available. The disputed domain name was registered on March 14, 2025, more than six years after the Complainant's trademark priority date of June 5, 2018, demonstrating that the Complainant had ample opportunity to register this or similar domain names, yet did not do so.

The Respondent further observes that numerous alternative domain names remain available, confirming the Complainant's lack of action over time. The Respondent emphasizes that the website associated with the disputed domain name has never used or referred to the ONLYFANS trademark, nor has it displayed any logos, or trade dress of the Complainant, and that no actions were taken to mislead users or suggest any affiliation with the Complainant. Prior to receiving the Notification of Complaint, the Complainant made no direct contact regarding the disputed domain name, which indicates, according to the Respondent, a lack of good faith attempt to resolve the matter before initiating the proceedings.

Upon receiving Notification of the Complaint, the Respondent voluntarily configured a redirection from the site's main page for the duration of the administrative proceedings, demonstrating his intention to act in good faith and avoid any potential misunderstanding. In conclusion, the Respondent asserts that the registration and use of the disputed domain name were entirely legitimate, that the Complainant failed to protect its interests in a timely manner, and requests that the Panel dismiss the Complaint in its entirety.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. 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.

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).

The Complaint has been submitted in English, and the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceedings. The Complainant argued that English is appropriate because the Respondent is presumed to understand English, whereas translating the Complaint into Russian would cause unreasonable expenses and delay. The disputed domain name is composed entirely of English words, was previously configured to redirect to English-language websites, and, after filing, currently redirects to the domain name <google.com>, also in English. These factors provide evidence that the Respondent is capable of understanding English.

The Center has sent all its communications to the Respondent in both English and Russian, and has invited the Respondent to express his views on the language of the proceedings. While the Respondent indicated potential difficulties in reviewing materials in English, he did not formally object to the proceedings being conducted in English. The Respondent was, moreover, given the opportunity to file a Response in Russian, and his arguments were taken into account by the Panel in reaching its decision.

Having considered all relevant circumstances, including the Respondent's ability to understand English, the lack of formal objection, and the need to avoid undue delay or expenses by translating all materials for the Complainant, the Panel finds it appropriate to exercise its discretion under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules. The Panel concludes that conducting the proceedings in English is fair, reasonable, and efficient and that the Respondent will not be disadvantaged by this decision. Accordingly, the Panel determines that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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 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, “vip” and the hyphen, 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 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.

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 Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, or otherwise authorized to use the ONLYFANS trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the trademarks. The Respondent is also not known to be associated with the ONLYFANS trademarks, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.

Furthermore, based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain, to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Indeed, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name previously redirected users to third-party websites, at least some of which offered competing adult entertainment and dating services. Such conduct cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services and does not confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3.

The Panel therefore finds that the circumstances of this case affirm, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Accordingly, the Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that the Respondent lacks any 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.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant demonstrate that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel notes that the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademarks substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. At the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant's trademark enjoyed significant recognition among Internet users, as evidenced by the high global traffic ranking of the Complainant's website. Therefore, the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark in its entirety together with the term "vip". Noting the use of the disputed domain name, this combination is unlikely to have been coincidental. Importantly, the Respondent did not deny in his Response that he was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration. Instead, he argued that the Complainant could have registered the disputed domain name earlier but failed to do so - an argument which cannot justify the Respondent's registration, particularly where the disputed domain name is used in a manner that clearly targets, and seeks to take unfair advantage of, the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name previously redirected to third-party adult entertainment and dating websites that compete with, or are otherwise related to, the Complainant's business. Such conduct clearly indicates that the Respondent was aware of the nature of the business associated with the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademarks and intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, this circumstance shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Therefore, the Panel accepts the Complainant's evidence and finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name for the purpose of capitalizing on the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks to target the Complainant's rights.

Accordingly, 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 <vip-onlyfans.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alissia Shchichka/

Alissia Shchichka

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2025