

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Kavala Osman, Diyabekir
Case No. D2025-4780

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Kavala Osman, Diyabekir, United Kingdom ("UK").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfans-porn.shop> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (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 name. On November 19, 2025, 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 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 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Gilberto Martins de Almeida 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 Fenix International Limited, a globally known company. Its relevant trademarks have been registered in the European Union ("EU") since 2019 and in United Kingdom ("UK") since 2020, as per the following registrations for ONLYFANS: EU Trade Mark No. 017912377 (registered on January 9, 2019); EU Trade Mark No. 017946559 (registered on January 19, 2019); UK Trade Mark No. UK00917912377 (registered on January 9, 2019); and UK Trade Mark No. UK00917946559 (registered on January 19, 2019). As for domain names, the Complainant has registered the domain name <onlyfans.com> since 2013.

Regarding the disputed domain name, <onlyfans-porn.shop>, it was registered on August 17, 2025. The associated website has been used by the Respondent to provide adult entertainment services that purportedly compete with those of the Complainant. According to the Complainant, some of the content was pirated from the Complainant's users.

With respect to the Respondent, there is no information available.

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 Respondent used the disputed domain name to attract users to its website, by way of confusion, as the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks previously registered by the Complainant. Accordingly, the Complainant also alleges that the Respondent is acting in bad faith, since he has used for its own financial benefit previously registered trademarks over which it holds no rights, as well as it is unlikely that the Respondent did not know these trademarks before registering them.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term “-porn” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent was impersonating the Complainant, intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a clear likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s registered mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the above reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <onlyfans-porn.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gilberto Martins de Almeida/
Gilberto Martins de Almeida
Sole Panelist
Date: December 29, 2025*