

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Roger Chase
Case No. D2025-3789

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Roger Chase, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 17, 2025. On September 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Privacy User #14eb2fae) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 19, 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Pascal Böhner 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name, <onlyfans.com> on February 9, 2019. It resolves to a website that redirects users to a webpage on “chaturbate.com,” which offers adult content services in direct competition with the Complainant’s business.

The Complainant, Fenix International Limited, operates the website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com>. The Complainant provides a platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content (mainly adult content) on the Internet, currently having more than 305 million registered users. The Complainant has made extensive use of the ONLYFANS trademark in connection with its services.

The Complainant owns registered trademark rights in the ONLYFANS mark in multiple jurisdictions, including:

- European Union Trademark No. 017912377 ONLYFANS (word mark), for classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42, applied for on June 5, 2018 and registered on January 9, 2019
- United Kingdom Trademark No. UK00917912377 ONLYFANS (word mark) - cloned from the above mentioned EU trademark (following Brexit), hence also with a filing date of June 5, 2018 and registration date of January 9, 2019 and for the same classes
- United States Trademark No. 5769267 ONLYFANS (word mark), for class 35, filed on October 29, 2018 and registered on June 4, 2019

The EU trademark (and its cloned UK mark following Brexit) were thus registered one month before the date of the registration of the disputed domain name (February 9, 2019). The US trademark, while filed in October 2018, was not registered until June 4, 2019, approximately four months after the registration of the disputed domain name.

Many Panel decisions have acknowledged the Complainant’s rights in the ONLYFANS mark under the UDRP and found that the mark is “well known” or a mark with a reputation in many countries in the world. The Panel has no reason to doubt this finding and considers the mark ONLYFANS to be well known today. The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on May 28, 2025, demanding the cessation of use and cancellation of the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not reply to this correspondence.

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.

(i) Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name, <onlyfans.com>, is confusingly similar to its registered ONLYFANS trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s mark in its entirety, with the addition of an extra letter “f” between “only” and “fans.” The Complainant argues that this constitutes a clear case of typosquatting, which is intended to mislead Internet users and does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity under the Policy.

(ii) No Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized or licensed to use the ONLYFANS trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect users to a competing website, "chaturbate.com," which offers adult content services. The Complainant contends that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use under the Policy.

(iii) Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intention of targeting the Complainant's trademark and business, after the Complainant has obtained rights in the trademark ONLYFANS.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect users to a competing website demonstrates an intent to disrupt the Complainant's business and to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent's failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letter sent on May 28, 2025, and its use of a privacy service to conceal its identity, are additional indicators of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three elements are present:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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

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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. In particular, the Complainant has demonstrated ownership of registered trademark rights in the ONLYFANS mark, including EU and US trademark registrations for the word mark ONLYFANS. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is the owner of the trademark ONLYFANS registered in several jurisdictions.

The Complainant also claimed common law rights in the ONLYFANS mark dating back to July 2016. However, the Complainant has not provided evidence to substantiate this claim. Noting the finding regarding registered trademark rights, the Panel need not make a finding on the alleged common law rights for the purposes of this element. See, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.3.

While more relevant under the second and third elements of the Policy, the Panel notes here that the Complainant's EU (and cloned UK) trademarks, registered on January 9, 2019, predate the registration of the disputed domain name (February 9, 2019).

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark. The disputed domain name, <onlyffans.com>, incorporates the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark in its entirety, with the addition of an extra letter "f" between "only" and "fans." The Panel finds that the addition of this single letter constitutes a clear case of typosquatting, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. The Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

It is well established that the addition of a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") such as ".com" is typically disregarded when assessing confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9 (misspellings).

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for a redirection to websites with competing services can not confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Here the Panel notes that the Respondent has used a domain name including a typosquatted version of the Complainant's well known mark to redirect to a website offering competing services with the Complainant's services.

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.

Registration in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As a preliminary remark, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered on February 9, 2019, and subsequently updated on October 28, 2024. In accordance with consensus panel practice, the relevant date for assessing whether the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith is the date of initial registration, not the date of any subsequent update or renewal, as suggested by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.9. Accordingly, the Panel's analysis focuses on the circumstances as they existed in February 2019.

The Complainant has demonstrated ownership of registered trademark rights in the ONLYFANS mark in the European Union, with a registration date of January 9, 2019. This trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name (February 9, 2019). While the Complainant has not provided evidence of prior trademark registrations in Canada, where the Respondent is based, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's EU trademark rights and other commercial activities and intended to target the Complainant while registering the disputed domain name with a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has not provided conclusive evidence to demonstrate that it has unregistered rights to the ONLYFANS mark. However, given the overall circumstances of this case and the fact that the disputed domain name constitutes typosquatting, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name strongly suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark and the use of the "www.onlyfans.com" website at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and sought to target it.

The Respondent has not provided any evidence or arguments to rebut the Complainant's contentions or to demonstrate any legitimate reason for registering the disputed domain name.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Use in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name is being used 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1. In particular, paragraph 4(b)(iv) provides that the following circumstance shall be evidence of bad faith use: the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website that redirects users to a webpage on "chaturbate.com," which offers adult content services similar to those offered by the Complainant and in direct competition with the Complainant's main business. This redirection creates a likelihood of confusion, as Internet users who mistype the Complainant's domain name will be diverted to a competing service provider. Such users are likely to believe, at least initially, that the competing website is somehow affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Panel finds that this redirection to a competing website offering the same type of services constitutes an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by exploiting the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has argued that the Respondent's use of a privacy service and failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letter are indicators of bad faith. The Panel notes these assertions but does not consider these factors conclusive to the assessment of bad faith use in the present case.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. 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 <onlyffans.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pascal Böhner/

Pascal Böhner

Sole Panelist

Date: November 4, 2025