

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Phone Myint
Case No. D2026-0694

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Phone Myint, Myanmar.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <asiaonlyfan.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 18, 2026. On February 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 20, 2026, 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 / NO DATA PROVIDED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 20, 2026, 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 February 20, 2026.

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 February 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Velasco Santelices as the sole panelist in this matter on March 20, 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 its domain name for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows Internet users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web. In providing its services, the Complainant has made extensive use of its ONLYFANS trademark. The Complainant has registered rights in the trademark with the European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”), the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (“UKIPO”), and the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), and the Complainant has developed extensive common law rights throughout the world.

Further, in the European Union and United Kingdom, the Complainant has registrations in multiple classes for the ONLYFANS word and design marks. In the United States, Complainant has registrations for the ONLYFANS, ONLYFANS.COM, and OFTV word marks in various classes and the lock logo and OF design marks. The Complainant also holds International registrations on the word ONLYFANS and OF design marks under the Madrid Protocol, and the Complainant has pursued registrations across the world in numerous countries.

Some of the many relevant registered trademarks and service marks (detailed in Attachment “C” of the Complaint) on which it is based, including the goods or services in connection with which the mark is being used, are the following:

ONLYFANS; US Registration #5,769,267 in class 35, dated June 4, 2019.

OFTV; US Registration #6,918,929 in class 9, dated December 2, 2022.

OF (design in stylized letters); US Registration #6,918,292 in class 9, dated December 6, 2022.

ONLYFANS; US Registration #6,253,455 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42, dated January 26, 2021.

ONLYFANS.COM; US Registration #5,769,268 in class 35, dated June 4, 2019.

ONLYFANS; United Kingdom Registration #00917912377 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42, dated January 9, 2019.

ONLYFANS (with OF in stylized design); European Union Registration #017946559 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42, dated January 9, 2019.

The <onlyfans.com> domain name was registered by the Complainant 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 name directs to an apparent login page. Moreso, the website at the disputed domain name contains a logo that incorporates the Complainant’s registered OF logo.

Consequently, the Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name not because it refers to or is associated with Respondent, but because the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the <onlyfans.com> domain name and marks used by Complainant in association with 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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it is the owner of the registered trademarks ONLYFANS and ONLYFANS.COM, so it cannot be questioned that the disputed domain name <asianonlyfan.com> is confusingly similar to those trademarks. The disputed domain name reproduces the ONLYFANS trademark in its entirety. It is identical, save for the removal of the "s" in the Complainant's trademark ONLYFANS and the descriptive word "asia" added at the beginning of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. To the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has never acquired any trademark rights in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's trademark rights have been recognized in over one hundred and fifty other UDRP decisions, resulting in the cancellation or transfer of the disputed domain names to Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similarity

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of trademarks and service marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "asia") 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 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 given the Complainant had well-recognized rights years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, bad faith use should be found. The Complainant’s trademarks were registered several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The trademarks ONLYFANS and ONLYFANS.COM are internationally well known, and so is the design trademark OF. Therefore, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant’s trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. That fact cannot be a simple coincidence.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity or illegal activity here claimed as applicable to this case: a login page that is likely to collect sensitive information in a potential phishing scam and passing off constitute bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds 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 <asiaonlyfan.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Velasco Santelices/

Rodrigo Velasco Santelices

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2026