

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. Svetoslav Stoilov  
Case No. D2025-4937

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Svetoslav Stoilov, United Kingdom.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <onlyfansleakedvideo.com> and <onlyfanspornleaks.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 26, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 27, 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, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 1, 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 December 1, 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 December 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Brigitte Joppich as the sole panelist in this matter on January 7, 2026. 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> and has used it for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web.

The Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks for ONLYFANS, including United Kingdom trademark registration no. UK00917912377, registered on January 9, 2019, which is protected for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42 (the “ONLYFANS Mark”). The Complainant’s trademark rights have been recognized in over one hundred and fifty other WIPO decisions, resulting in the cancellation or transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant. The Complainant’s domain name <onlyfans.com> was registered on January 29, 2013. In 2025, <onlyfans.com> was one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

The disputed domain names <onlyfanspornleaks.com> and <onlyfansleakedvideo.com> were registered on August 16, 2025, and September 3, 2025, respectively, and have been used in connection with commercial websites that offer adult entertainment content.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

With regard to the three elements specified in the Policy, paragraph 4(a), the Complainant contends that each of the three conditions is met in the present case.

(i) The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar with the ONLYFANS Mark. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain names consist of the ONLYFANS Mark with the only difference being the insertion of the descriptive terms “leaked”, “leaks”, “video”, and “porn” after the ONLYFANS Mark, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity.

(ii) The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. It contends 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 ONLYFANS Mark in the disputed domain names or in any other manner, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the ONLYFANS Mark and does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain names. The Complainant further contends that no evidence indicates that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain names and that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names offering adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant’s services does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests.

(iii) Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith. It states that the disputed domain names were registered long after the Complainant obtained registered rights in the ONLYFANS Mark, that the registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark creates a presumption of bad faith, that the ONLYFANS Mark has been recognized in numerous previous UDRP cases as well-known, and that the use of the disputed domain names in connection with services in direct competition with the Complainant is a further indication of bad faith registration. With regard to bad faith use, the Complainant contends that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names in connection with commercial websites that offer goods and services in direct competition with the Complainant 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 names and therefore use in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and
- (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 being used in bad faith.

### **A. Preliminary Procedural issue – Consolidation of Proceedings**

The Complaint filed a request for consolidation, which was not withdrawn as part of the amended complaint. However, given that the Registrar's verification response disclosed that the disputed domain names were both registered by the same person, this request has become obsolete.

### **B. 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 disputed domain names include the ONLYFANS Mark alongside the additional words "leaked", "leaks", "video", and "porn", respectively. The ONLYFANS Mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names, which are therefore confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS Mark under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant satisfied the requirements of the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

### **C. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Even though the Policy requires the complainant to prove that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, it is the consensus view among UDRP panels that a complainant has to make only a prima facie case to fulfill the requirements of the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii). As a result, once a prima facie case is made, the burden of coming forward with evidence of the respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name will then shift to the respondent.

The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and that the burden of production has been shifted to the Respondent.

The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to come forward with any allegations or evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Based on the evidence before it, the Panel cannot find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent either. In particular, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names in connection with commercial websites that offer goods and services in direct competition with the Complainant is not a bona fide use under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names under the Policy, paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c).

#### **D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Firstly, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the ONLYFANS Mark. Regarding the services in question, the ONLYFANS Mark is very well established, as already confirmed by previous WIPO decisions. In the Panel's view, these circumstances and the use of the disputed domain names by the Respondent for services in competition with those of the Complainant make it inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant's marks and thus in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Secondly, as to bad faith use, by fully incorporating the ONLYFANS Mark into the disputed domain names and by using them in connection with commercial websites that offer goods and services in direct competition with services rendered by the Complainant, the Respondent was, in all likelihood, trying to divert traffic intended for the Complainant's website to its own for commercial gain as set out under the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv). The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Respondent also used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith and that the Complainant satisfied the requirements of the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii).

#### **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(i), and the Rules, paragraph 15, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <onlyfansleakedvideo.com> and <onlyfanspornleaks.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Brigitte Joppich/*

**Brigitte Joppich**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 14, 2026