

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. GO GAMING, GO GAMING
Case No. D2025-4100

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is GO GAMING, GO GAMING, Thailand.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <onlyfanth.net> and <onlyfan-vk.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 October 7, 2025. On October 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 8, 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 October 9, 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 October 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 October 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Simone Huser as the sole panelist in this matter on November 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 operates and owns the domain name <onlyfans.com>. The Complainant has used its domain name for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content, mostly of erotic or pornographic character. The website hosted at the domain name <onlyfans.com> currently has more than 300 million registered users.

The Complainant registered the domain name <onlyfans.com> on January 29, 2013.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

- ONLYFANS, European Union Trademark Registration No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019, in international classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.
- ONLYFANS, United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00917912377, registered on January 9, 2019, in international classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.
- ONLYFANS, United States Trademark Registration No. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019, in international class 35.

The disputed domain names were registered on May 24, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolve to websites in connection with services that are similar to those of the Complainant, featuring audiovisual content of erotic or pornographic character including watermarked content from the Complainant's website.

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 as follows:

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because they incorporate this trademark in its singular form "onlyfan", and the addition of the letters "th" and "vk", respectively, is not sufficient to avoid confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The trademark ONLYFANS has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its services. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark and is not commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names were registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its trademark ONLYFANS at the time it registered the disputed domain names. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names to offer services in direct competition with the Complainant (including watermarked content pirated from Complainant's users).

The Respondent is using the disputed domain names in bad faith, by intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of their websites.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (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 or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The omission of the letter "s" of the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain names is considered an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's mark and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9

Although the addition of other terms here, "th" and "-vk", respectively, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 that the Complainant's 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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net" and ".com" in the disputed domain names is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The Respondent has neither been granted a license nor has it been otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use its ONLYFANS trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. There is no reason to believe that the Respondent’s name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain names, and the Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names resolve to commercially active websites offering services in direct competition with the Complainant, including watermarked content from the Complainant’s website. Such use of the disputed domain names obviously neither qualifies as bona fide offering of services nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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.

The circumstances of this case leave no doubt that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant’s business and its rights in the ONLYFANS trademark when registering the disputed domain names. Using the disputed domain names to run websites offering content in direct competition with the Complainant (including watermarked content taken from the Complainant’s website) and thereby prominently displaying the sign “ONLYFAN” similar to the Complainant’s mark, is a clear indication that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own websites by creating a likelihood of confusing with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent’s websites. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <onlyfanth.net> and <onlyfan-vk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Simone Huser/

Simone Huser

Sole Panelist

Date: November 18, 2025