

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Giovanni Medrano
Case No. D2025-3078

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Giovanni Medrano, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansaccount.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 1, 2025. On August 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 5, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 5, 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 August 5, 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 August 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Stefan Naumann as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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 UK company that operates a social media platform <onlyfans.com> since 2016 and notably owns the United States trademarks ONLYFANS (No. 5 769 267) and ONLYFANS.COM (No. 5 769 268) both registered on June 4, 2019, both indicating a first use in commerce on July 4, 2016, and both covering services in class 35 of the Nice Classification of goods and services. The Complainant also owns the European Union and United Kingdom trademarks ONLYFANS (No. EU 017912377 and UK00917912377) with a common filing date on June 5, 2018, and registration date of January 9, 2019, for products and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42 of the Nice Classification of goods and services.

The Complainant has submitted copies of the registrations of the United States trademarks it owns as well as a list of some of its other ONLYFANS trademarks in other jurisdictions and indicates that it also owns the domain name <onlyfans.com>. All of the trademarks were registered before 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 12, 2025. The Complainant indicates that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that solicits third-party login data under the guise of signing up or logging in to “Onlyfans”.

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 its ONLYFANS trademarks predate the disputed domain name, that they are well known, with 305 million registered users of its social media platform and are actively used for the Complainant’s online business activities, that the Respondent has no permission from the Complainant to use the Complainant’s trademarks or apply for a domain name with the Complainant’s trademarks, that the Respondent is not commonly known by and does not have a right or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offer of goods and services, and that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant submits evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that allows or requires login information and argues that the fraudulent use of the disputed domain name (i) constitutes neither a bona fide offer of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial use, and (ii) constitutes bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant must demonstrate that all three elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name must be identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

- (ii) the Respondent must have no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name must have been registered and used in bad faith.

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. As noted above, paragraphs 10(b) and 10(d) of the Rules provide that a panel shall ensure that the parties are treated with equality and shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality, and weight of the evidence.

Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under, the Rules, a panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate.

In the present matter, the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

While the Respondent's failure to respond does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, the Panel is entitled to draw appropriate inferences therefrom, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), paragraph 4.3).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for the first element requires a reasoned but straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark(s) and the disputed domain name ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7).

The disputed domain name combines the ONLYFANS trademarks with the term "account" and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com".

For assessing identity or confusing similarity in the present matter, the Panel considers that the ONLYFANS trademarks are fully reproduced and remain recognizable in the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that the addition of the term "account" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel is thus satisfied that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademarks for the purposes of the Policy.

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 complainants, panels regularly consider that once a complainant has made out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence demonstrating his or her rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If a respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests and finds no indication in the evidence that the Respondent could claim rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the terms “onlyfans” are common English dictionary words arrayed in a grammatically correct order.

The Complainant argued that over 150 UDRP decisions have recognized common law rights or rights in the ONLYFANS trademarks.

The Panel is satisfied that the terms “onlyfans” have acquired distinctiveness as a result of Complainant’s use and success, and are perceived by the public, including not only the users of the <onlyfans.com> platform but also the wider public.

Panels have recognized that mere registration of a domain name that is comprised of a confirmed dictionary word or phrase may not of itself confer rights or legitimate interests in the domain name unless the domain name is shown to be genuinely used or at least demonstrably intended for use in connection with the relied-upon meaning, and not, for example, to trade off third-party rights in such word or phrase. Panels also tend to look at factors such as the status and fame of the relevant mark and whether a respondent has registered and legitimately used other domain names containing dictionary words or phrases in connection with the respective dictionary meaning ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10; WIPO Overview 2.0, section 2.2).

Neither the record nor the circumstances of the case point to any circumstances that may support a rights or legitimate interests defense.

The Respondent has chosen not to reply to the Complaint and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Since the Respondent has no permission from the Complainant and chose not to respond to the Complaint, its registration of the disputed domain name is without rights or legitimate interests notably in light of the apparent use of the disputed domain name targeting the Complainant’s trademarks. The disputed domain name resolves to a website with the heading “Join Only Fans” and refers to an email address connected to the Complainant’s domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name combining the Complainant’s mark with the term “account” suggests an implied affiliation as the Complainant operates a social media platform that requires registering or opening an account to access, offer or receive user-generated content on the platform ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1).

The Panel therefore finds that in the present case the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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).

Previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activities such as phishing or impersonation/passing off are considered evidence of bad faith use ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.4).

In the present matter, the Complainant argues that the Respondent’s website allows the Respondent to gather third-party login data under the guise of signing up or logging in to Complainant’s “onlyfans” platform.

Although the evidence of the alleged phishing is circumstantial, the Panel considers it likely that the disputed domain name could be used for phishing purposes. The Panel is notably persuaded by the fact that the website has tabs for “my profile” and “add card”. Using a domain name that combines the ONLYFANS

trademarks and the term “account” where the trademarks are well-known notably for adult content and where the <onlyfans.com> website requires logging in and the reference to the Complainant’s domain name on the website suggest that the Respondent knew of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

Based on the necessarily limited record in UDRP proceedings, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

Here, the record shows that:

- (i) the Respondent apparently is located in the United States.,
- (ii) Complainant’s trademarks are well-known notably in the United States.,
- (iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name that fully incorporates the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademarks, and
- (iv) the Respondent has more likely than not intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

In the present case, the Panel is thus persuaded that the facts of this case as reflected in the limited record available in a UDRP proceeding support a finding that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name was in bad faith.

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 <onlyfansaccount.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Stefan Naumann/

Stefan Naumann

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2025