

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Meloar Lopes
Case No. D2025-3080

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S.").

The Respondent is Meloar Lopes, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bestonlyfan.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") 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 the same day, 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, Domains By Proxy, LLC) 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 the same day.

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 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Monica Novac as the sole panelist in this matter on September 5, 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 owns and operates the website at the domain name <onlyfans.com> and has used said domain name 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 registered the domain name <onlyfans.com> on January 29, 2013, and as of 2025, it is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant owns several ONLYFANS trademarks in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 017912377 ONLYFANS (word) in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42, registered on January 9, 2019; and
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. 00917912377 ONLYFANS (word) in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42, registered on January 9, 2019.

The Complainant also owns the following figurative trademarks:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 691829  in class 9, registered on December 6, 2022;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 691829  in class 9, registered on December 6, 2022;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 6938572  in classes 38, 41 and 42, registered on January 3, 2023; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 6938573  in classes 38, 41 and 42, registered on January 3, 2023.

The Complainant contends that it has extensive common law rights in ONLYFANS throughout the world that commenced by, at latest, July 4, 2016; this has also been recognized in previous UDRP panel decisions (see *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Admin, Beacons AI Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0113](#)).

The Respondent is Meloar Lopes, reportedly located in France. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on March 20, 2025 through a privacy service. The website at the Disputed Domain Name advertises the competing “MYM” adult entertainment content creator subscription platform which is in direct competition with the services offered by the Complainant under its registered trademarks. The platform offers users to create a “MYM Fans” account.

On May 27, 2025, the Complainant’s lawyers sent a cease-and-desist letter (via e-mail) addressed to the “Registrant of bestonlyfan.com”, demanding, among others, the cessation of any infringing acts and the cancellation of the Disputed Domain Name, however no reply was received.

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 Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademarks;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of obtaining commercial gain further to attracting Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating confusion with the Complainant's well-known marks.

The Complainant cited several prior UDRP panel decisions involving the Complainant's trademark rights to support its Complaint.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant to succeed 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; and
- (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

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 Panel finds that the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

UDRP panels held that a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. In this case, the fact that the Disputed Domain Name misses the ending letter "s" within the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Although the addition of the other term here, "best", 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 Complainant's mark for the purpose of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1, the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” in the Disputed Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Further to all the above, 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.

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.

It is accepted by the Panel that the Respondent is not related to the Complainant and that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized nor consented to the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s trademark in the Disputed Domain Name or in any other manner.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel considers that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, coupled with its use for a website that advertises services in direct competition with the Complainant’s business, while displaying the Complainant’s trademark, signals the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s mark. Thus, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent does not use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name as per the Policy.

The Respondent did not respond to the Complainant’s contentions, thus the Respondent did not present any evidence for supporting any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Further to all the above, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name after the Complainant registered and used its ONLYFANS trademark. In view of the global fame of the Complainant, as well as the international recognition and well-known character of its ONLYFANS trademark and the composition and use of the Disputed Domain Name, it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and business when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In view of the above, the Panel considers that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name consists of the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark, omitting the ending letter "s", plus the term "best". Moreover, the website at the Disputed Domain Name displays a logo which is highly similar to the Complainant's OF figurative mark (as listed under section 4 above) next to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark; this, together with the offering of services in competition to those provided by the Complainant, indicates the Respondent's intent to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant, which is a clear proof of bad faith.

As mentioned, the Disputed Domain Name directs to a website which offers a competing adult entertainment content creator subscription platform which is in direct competition with the Complainant's services. The Panel considers that the Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name primarily for obtaining commercial benefits by creating a likelihood of confusion for Internet users, as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes the Respondent's failure to reply to the cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant's lawyers on May 27, 2025, which may be considered as a further indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

Finally, the Respondent hid its identity when registering the Disputed Domain Name by using a privacy shield service. As per [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.6, there are recognized legitimate uses of privacy and proxy registration services; the circumstances in which such services are used, including whether the respondent is operating a commercial and trademark-abusive website, can impact a panel's assessment of bad faith. The Panel is of the opinion that in view of all circumstances of this case, the Respondent's use of privacy service further supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Further to all the above, 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 <bestonlyfan.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Monica Novac/

Monica Novac

Sole Panelist

Date: September 19, 2025