

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. kramble ble
Case No. D2025-3762

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is kramble ble, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfanz-z.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 16, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 17, 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 for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 18, 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 September 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on October 23, 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 website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com>, which was registered on January 29, 2013. The Complainant uses this domain name in connection with the provision of a social media platform under the ONLYFANS brand that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the Internet. The Complainant is also the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the ONLYFANS word and design marks, including the following:

- ONLYFANS, United States Reg. No. 5769267, registered June 4, 2019, in class 35, for arranging subscriptions of the online publications of others;
- ONLYFANS.COM, United States Reg. No. 5769268, registered June 4, 2019, in class 35; and
- ONLYFANS, United States Reg. No. 6253455, registered January 26, 2021, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The Respondent, located in the United States, registered the disputed domain name on April 15, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that advertises subscriptions to adult content from creators, that the Complainant alleges is in direct competition with its services.

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 the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark, with a "z" replacing the "s" in "fans", and with an additional "-z", which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity. See *Fenix International Limited v. AMF AMF*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3377](#); *Fenix International Limited v. OnlyforFanz*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0805](#).

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent to use the Complainant's marks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent is not commonly known by the marks and does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name. As previously noted, the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to host a commercial website that advertises goods and services in direct competition with the Complainant does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests.

Lastly, the Complainant avers that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant attained registered rights in the ONLYFANS marks. The ONLYFANS mark is widely known, and previous panels have consistently found that the registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark creates a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 3.1.4.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent demanding the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not respond to the letter, which the Complainant claims is further evidence of bad faith. Additional evidence of bad faith is the disputed domain name directs to a commercial website that offers adult entertainment content in direct competition with the Complainant's services. Such use is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name contains the ONLYFANS mark, with a "z" replacing the "s" in "fans", and with an additional "-z". A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms here, "-z", 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 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.

The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or consented to the Respondent's use of the Complainant's marks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence that the Respondent holds any trademark rights in the disputed domain name.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is using the domain name for a bona fide offering, or a legitimate or noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the disputed domain name is being used to host a commercial website that advertises adult content in direct competition with the Complainant's registered services. The Complainant further asserts that the website includes "providing entertainment services ... in the nature of a website featuring non-downloadable video, photographs, images, audio, and ... in the field of adult entertainment." The Respondent's use conveys the false impression about a relationship with the Complainant, and was capable of misleading and diverting Internet users away from the Complainant. Such use does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests. See *Fenix International Limited v. Danesco Trading Ltd. / Mikasantik Dikalov*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0593](#); *Fenix International Limited v. finne finnew*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3232](#).

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name a number of years after the Complainant attained rights in its internationally widely known ONLYFANS trademark. The use of the disputed domain name to offer adult content services directly competing with those of the Complainant reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, seeking to mislead Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion.

The disputed domain name is also a typo of the Complainant's widely-known mark. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4; *Fenix International Limited v. OnlyforFanz*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0805](#).

Further indices of bad faith include the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, and failure to respond to the present Complaint.

Based on the totality of the evidence presented, the Panel concludes that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark for its own commercial gain by registering and using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <onlyfanz-z.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gary Saposnik/

Gary Saposnik

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025