

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. zun long
Case No. D2025-4785

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is zun long, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <onlyfans-apps.com>, <onlyfans-cg.com>, <onlyfans-cn.com>, <onlyfans-cyou.com>, <onlyfans-film.com>, <onlyfans-login.com>, <onlyfans-movie.com>, <onlyfans-tv.com>, <onlyfans-world.com>, and <onlyfans-zh.com> are registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 18, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 20, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 20, 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 November 20, 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 November 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules,

paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Mario Soerensen Garcia as the sole panelist in this matter on December 18, 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 is a company known for operating the social media platform called "OnlyFans" founded in 2016.

The Complainant is the owner of several ONLYFANS trademarks registered well before the registration of the disputed domain names, such as:

1. The United Kingdom trademark registration no. 00917912377, for ONLYFANS, with registration date on January 9, 2019;
2. European Union trademark registration no. 017912377, for ONLYFANS, with registration date on January 9, 2019; and
3. The United States of America trademark registration no. 5,769,267, for ONLYFANS, with registration on date June 4, 2019.

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

The Respondent is zun long, from China.

The disputed domain names were registered on August 19, 2025, and resolve to websites that offer adult entertainment content in direct competition with the Complainant's 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 names.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark.

According to the evidence presented by the Complainant, the disputed domain names resolve to websites that offer adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant's services.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names for legitimate purposes, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant finds that the disputed domain names are used to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's rights for commercial gain, since Internet users and the Complainant's customers would inevitably associate the content related to the disputed domain names with the Complainant's prior trademarks.

The Complainant stresses that the Respondent is not commonly known by the term "onlyfans."

According to the Complainant, it has prior rights over its trademarks and has not authorized the registration and use of the disputed domain names, nor the use of its trade name and trademarks by the Respondent.

The Respondent is not affiliated to or authorized by the Complainant to use or register the disputed domain names.

The Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights and has clearly registered the disputed domain names to target the Complainant's trademark, and that the registration of the disputed domain names was conducted in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names.

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 following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 mark ONLYFANS is reproduced 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 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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names or that before any notice of the dispute the Respondent has made use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The nature of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation.

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 Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent on September 27, 2025 demanding the Respondent to stop using and to cancel the disputed domain names, which was not replied by the Respondent.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark as the disputed domain names incorporate the ONLYFANS mark in its entirety and are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s domain name <onlyfans.com>. Besides, the Complainant’s trademark registrations predate the registration date of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names resolve to active websites that offer adult entertainment content in direct competition with the Complainant’s services.

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.

The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to his own websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 <onlyfans-apps.com>, <onlyfans-cg.com>, <onlyfans-cn.com>, <onlyfans-cyou.com>, <onlyfans-film.com>, <onlyfans-login.com>, <onlyfans-movie.com>, <onlyfans-tv.com>, <onlyfans-world.com>, and <onlyfans-zh.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mario Soerensen Garcia/

Mario Soerensen Garcia

Sole Panelist

Date: January 1, 2026