

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. Dulat Sarsenov  
Case No. D2025-3724

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Dulat Sarsenov, Kazakhstan.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <onlycoomerfans.com>, <onlyfapellofans.com>, <onlyleakedfans.com> and <only69fans.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 12, 2025. On September 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On the same day, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 18, 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 the same day.

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 September 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 6, 2025. On October 15, 2025, the Center commenced the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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's business is to operate and to provide a social media platform that allows Internet users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the Internet, including content for adult entertainment. The Complainant's social media platform is located at the domain name <onlyfans.com>, which was registered on January 29, 2013, and use of which has commenced by July 4, 2016. In 2025, the Complainant's website under the domain name <onlyfans.com> counted more than 305 million registered users. Apart from the use as domain name, the Complainant uses the trademark ONLYFANS within its website at the domain name <onlyfans.com>.

The Complainant owns, according to Annex C of the Complaint, several trademarks for ONLYFANS, including but not limited to the following:

- United States ("US") trademark no. 5,769,267 ONLYFANS (word), registered on June 4, 2019, for services in Class 35;
- US trademark no. 6,253,455 ONLYFANS (fat lettering), registered on January 26, 2021, for goods and services in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42; and
- European Union ("EU") trademark no. 17946559 ONLYFANS (black and blue device with blue keyhole), registered on January 9, 2019, for goods and services in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain names were all registered by the Respondent, Dulat Sarsenov, as follows: both <onlycoomerfans.com> and <only69fans.com> were registered on April 18, 2025, <onlyleakedfans.com> was registered on April 19, 2025, and <onlyfapellofans.com> on April 22, 2025 (as per Annex A to the Complaint). Before the filing of the present Complaint, all disputed domain names resolved to websites with content for adult entertainment (as per Annex D to the Complaint).

#### **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, the Complainant contends that all disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark. According to the Complainant, the addition of the terms "69", "coomer", "fapello", and "leaked", respectively, does not eliminate the confusing similarity. The Complainant claims that its trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain names as all four terms respectively inserted between within its trademark are descriptive.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, as there is no affiliation with, or authorization from, the Complainant to use the marks. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not commonly known by the trademarks and does not hold any trademark rights for the disputed domain names. The Complainant finds that it has achieved global fame and success in a short time, making it obvious that the Respondent knew about the Complainant's trademark upon registration of the disputed domain names. In addition, the Complainant points to the disputed domain names resolving to websites offering services similar to those provided by the Complainant, allegedly frequently containing content pirated from the Complainant's website. Such use in direct competition to the Complainant cannot give rise to legitimate rights or interests.

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. As to registration in bad faith, the Complainant states that all disputed domain names were registered long after the Complainant registered its trademarks and after it had acquired distinctiveness, given that its <onlyfans.com> website is one of the most visited websites in the world. Thus, says the Complainant, the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's rights upon registration of the disputed domain names. This, according to the Complainant, is further underlined by the Respondent hiding behind a privacy shield upon registration and its non-response to the cease and desist letter sent to him by the Complainant (as per Annex D to the Complaint). The content of the Respondent's websites under the disputed domain names also shows that the Respondent already upon registration intended to profit from the goodwill vested in the Complainant's trademarks. As to use in bad faith, the Complainant again points to the content of the websites, to which the disputed domain names resolves, which is in direct competition with the services of the Complainant and even contains material pirated from the Complainant's website. This, the Complainant concludes, is an intentional attempt to divert Internet users to the Respondent's websites by creating a likelihood of confusion

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that there is no infringement of the Complainant's trademarks, because, within the disputed domain names, the words "only" and "fans" are separated by other words.

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

The addition of the terms "coomer", "fapello", "69", and "leaked", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the respective disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. As for "fapello", this appears to be a third party mark or designation, the addition of which within the disputed domain name <onlyfapellofans.com> is insufficient in itself to avoid a finding of confusing similarity according to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.12.

In conclusion, 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 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. In this regard, the Panel notes the Respondent's unsupported contentions regarding the composition of the disputed domain names does not account for the Respondent's incorporation of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain names (regardless of additional terms), nor its use to offer competing services, and does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation, 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 notes that the Respondent has registered all four disputed domain names a considerable time after the first use of the domain name <onlyfans.com> by the Complainant and the registration of its ONLYFANS trademarks. As demonstrated by the Complainant's Annex D, the Respondent uses the disputed domain names for offering adult entertainment to Internet users. These services are identical to services which the Complainant offers on its website. In this context, the choice of the additional terms "coomer", "fapello", "69", and "leaked" to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademarks in the disputed domain names suggests knowledge of the Complainant. According to a brief Internet search, which is within the powers of the Panel according to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8, the terms "coomer" and "69" have a descriptive meaning in relation to adult entertainment. "Fapello" appears to be the name of a social media platform similar to the one of the Complainant. As for "leaked", in relation to social media this means something revealed which was meant to be kept private. The Panel holds it to be inconceivable that all of this is merely accidental, rather it appears the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <onlycoomerfans.com>, <onlyfapellofans.com>, <onlyleakedfans.com>, and <only69fans.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/*

**Andrea Jaeger-Lenz**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 5, 2025