

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. Steven Williams, onlyfansdates  
Case No. D2023-2518

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Steven Williams, onlyfansdates, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <onlyfansdate.com> is registered with Tucows Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 12, 2023. On June 12, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 12, 2023, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0165830302) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 13, 2023, 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 June 14, 2023.

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 June 16, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 7, 2023.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 2023. 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 registrations in numerous countries for the trademark ONLYFANS (the “Mark”) and trademarks incorporating the Mark, the earliest of which is United States Patent and Trademark Office Reg. No. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019.

The Complainant owns and operates the popular website “www.onlyfans.com” which has more than 180 million registered users. The Complainant’s website features recorded online performances posted by creators. Fans subscribe to view the creator’s content. *Fenix International Limited v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Andrei Ivanov*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3384](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 29, 2022. The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on March 2, 2023. There was no response to the cease-and-desist letter. The Complainant subsequently initiated this proceeding. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which purports to sponsor sweepstakes offering the opportunity to “win” a date with an “OnlyFans” model.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

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

The Complainant asserts the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark because the disputed domain name is composed of the Mark and the descriptive term “date,” utilized as a suffix.

The Complainant asserts that the Complainant never authorized the Respondent to use the disputed domain name, that the Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has never engaged in any *bona fide* commercial activity in connection with the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith to confuse unsuspecting Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name would resolve to a website affiliated or sponsored by the Complainant.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a 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 was registered and is being used in bad faith.

## A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark because the second-level of the disputed domain name is solely composed of the Mark and the term “date”. A domain name which wholly incorporates a complainant’s registered mark is sufficient to establish confusingly similarity for the purposes of the Policy when, as here, the Mark is a clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name notwithstanding the addition of another term. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.8 (“where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographic, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element”); *Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC / Regeneron Careers*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0013](#); and *Bombas LLC v. Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org / Maryellen J Dillard, Maryellen Dillard*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0609](#); *Fenix International Limited v. Whois Privacy, Private by Design LLC / Irina Guerrant*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0221](#).

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) of a disputed domain name, in this case “.com”, is disregarded for the purposes of assessment under the first element. The gTLD is a standard registration requirement. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1; *Monster Energy Company, a Delaware Corporation v. J.H.M. den Ouden*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1759](#); and *International Business Machines Corporation v. Sledge, Inc. / Frank Sledge*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0581](#).

The Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has specifically disavowed providing the Respondent with permission to use the disputed domain name or the Mark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way and does not have any business relationship with the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has conducted any *bona fide* business under the disputed domain name or is commonly known by the disputed domain name. *Compagnie de Saint Gobain v. Com-Union Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0020](#).

The Complainant has thus established a *prima facie* case in its favor, which shifts the burden of production on this point to the Respondent. The Respondent, however, has failed to come forth with any evidence showing any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Due to the similarity of the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s Mark, there is a high likelihood that of the Internet users will believe that the disputed domain name will resolve to a website that is sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant. Additionally, the Respondent’s website’s pages prominently features the Mark thereby strongly suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant.

The facts and circumstances presented to the Panel demonstrate that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

## C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, bad faith may be established by any one of the following scenarios:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) the respondent has registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the

respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

- (iii) the respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the disputed domain name, 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 the respondent's website or location.

The Panel finds the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Common sense compels the conclusion that the Respondent was quite aware of the Complainant's Mark when registering the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering dates with "OnlyFans" models which demonstrates the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's Mark and website services. Moreover, the Complainant's Mark is unique word combination that has no connotation of dating or sweepstake services.

Even if one were to accept the unbelievable proposition that the Respondent was unaware of the Mark, willful blindness is no excuse and does not avoid a finding of bad faith registration and use. *Instagram, LLC v. Contact Privacy Inc. / Sercan Lider*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0419](#). A simple Internet search, normally undertaken before registering a domain name, would have disclosed the Complainant's Mark. Given the wholesale adoption of the Mark in the disputed domain name, it is difficult to conceive of any use that the Respondent might make of the disputed domain name without the Complainant's consent that would not involve bad faith. *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#); *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1909](#) (where the reputation of a complainant in a given mark is significant and the mark bears strong similarities to the disputed domain name, the likelihood of confusion is such that bad faith may be inferred); *DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. KG v. Wise One, Wilson TECH*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0109](#); and *Monster Energy Company v. PrivacyDotLink Customer 116709 / Ferdinand Nikolaus Kronschnabl*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1335](#).

Additionally, under the circumstances of this case, an adverse inference of bad faith registration and use may be drawn from (i) the Respondent's failure to participate in the present proceeding, (ii) the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, and (iii) the registration of the disputed domain name under a privacy shield. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.6 and 4.3.

The Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <onlyfansdate.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/William F. Hamilton/*

**William F. Hamilton**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 16, 2023