

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Watuso Ally
Case No. D2025-4138

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Watuso Ally, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansleaked.fun> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 9, 2025. On October 10, 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 (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 October 14, 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 October 14, 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 October 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Leo (Yi) Liu as the sole panelist in this matter on November 11, 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 at the domain name <onlyfans.com> which is a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content. According to the Complainant, the domain name <onlyfans.com> is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users in 2025.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for ONLYFANS, including:

- European Union trademark registration No. 17912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00917912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 5,769,267 for ONLYFANS, registered on June 4, 2019 in class 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 10, 2025. As evidenced by the Complainant's screenshots, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying adult entertainment services, including content advertised as pirated from the Complainant's users.

On July 22, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. The Respondent did not reply.

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 confusingly similar to its well-known and distinctive trademark ONLYFANS;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To obtain the relief it has requested, the Complainant must prove the presence of each of the three elements of the Policy: 1) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; 2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and 3) 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.

Based on the record submitted, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ONLYFANS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that, despite the addition of the term "leaked" at the end of the disputed domain name, the ONLYFANS trademark remains recognizable.

Although the addition of the term "leaked" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Finally, generic Top-Level Domains, ".fun" in the case at hand, are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore 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.

As shown by the record, the disputed domain name resolves to a website which offers adult entertainment services (including watermarked content pirated from Complainant's users) in direct competition with the Complainant's services. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence that it has engaged in any use of or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent's name does not correspond to the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence to support a finding that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Nor is the Respondent making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Besides, panels have held that the use of a domain name for provision of pirated content can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 or 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 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 Complainant obtained rights in the mark ONLYFANS as early as 2019 - long before the disputed domain name was registered. The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark with a term "leaked" (which is commonly associated with unauthorized access to private content), along with the offering of adult entertainment services on the website at the disputed domain name, clearly demonstrate the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its brand. Consequently, the Panel infers that the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to offer adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant's services without authorization (some are even watermarked content pirated from the Complainant's users) is clearly intended to create a likelihood of confusion among Internet users, misleading them into believing that the Respondent is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant, for commercial gain. Having reviewed the record, the Panel concludes that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 name <onlyfansleaked.fun> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Leo (Yi) Liu/

Leo (Yi) Liu

Sole Panelist

Date: November 25, 2025