

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. finne finnew  
Case No. D2025-3232

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is finne finnew, Pitcairn, United Kingdom.

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

The disputed domain name <onlyfanscam.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 12, 2025. On August 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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 August 14, 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 14, 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Hong Yang as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 located at the domain name <onlyfans.com>. The website has operated for years in connection with a social media platform under the ONLYFANS brand that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual contents, mainly in the field of adult entertainment.

The Complainant owns various trademarks containing the term “onlyfans” globally, including the following: United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00917912377 for ONLYFANS (word), registered on January 9, 2019; United States Registration No.5769267 for ONLYFANS (word), registered on June 4, 2019; and European Union Trademark Registration No. 017946559 for ONLYFANS (word and device), registered on January 9, 2019.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 20, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering live streaming of and subscriptions to adult audiovisual contents.

#### **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.

##### **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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 here, “cam”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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.

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.

The Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name itself affirms the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation, incorporating the Complainant’s mark in full and merely adding a term “cam”, which is usually the abbreviation for the word “camera” relating to the Complainant’s field of business. Further, the available record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated or otherwise authorized by the Complainant or held any registration of the ONLYFANS mark anywhere. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website offering adult video connection and subscription services, similar to those offered by the Complainant. The Panel is convinced that this conveyed the false impression about a relationship with the Complainant and was capable of misleading and diverting visitors away from the Complainant. The Respondent was likely to gain commercial revenues from targeting the Complainant. Such use cannot constitute any bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 has used without any license or authorization the Complainant’s trademark in full in the disputed domain name plus a related term. The Complainant’s trademark ONLYFANS is widely used in multiple jurisdictions, and the Complainant’s registration and use of its marks predate the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s domain name under which its main business is established, namely, <onlyfans.com>. This signals the Respondent’s intention to target the Complainant and trade off its distinctive mark. Thus, the Panel considers that the Respondent should have known the Complainant’s mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

Further, considering the use of the disputed domain name analyzed in Section 6.B above, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s websites. The disputed domain name was thus registered and used in bad faith, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <onlyfanscam.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Hong Yang/*

**Hong Yang**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 29, 2025