

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. Michel Henk  
Case No. D2025-3788

### **1. The Parties**

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

Respondent is Michel Henk, Cyprus.

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

The disputed domain name <fansonlycoin.com> is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 17, 2025. On September 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 22, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 22, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 22, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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**

Complainant is a company that operates a social media platform at “www.onlyfans.com” which allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the Internet.

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of various trademarks relating to its ONLYFANS brand, inter alia, but not limited to, the following:

- word trademark ONLYFANS, European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), registration number: 017912377, registration date: January 9, 2019, status: active;
- word trademark ONLYFANS, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), registration number: 5,769,267, registration date: June 4, 2019, status: active.

Moreover, Complainant has demonstrated to own since 2013 the domain name <onlyfans.com> used to operate Complainant’s aforementioned social media platform at “www.onlyfans.com”.

Respondent, according to the Registrar verification, is located in Cyprus. The disputed domain name was registered on March 26, 2025; it resolves to a website at “www.fansonlycoin.com”, which operates an influencer marketplace set up in a color scheme similar to the one used by Complainant, prominently displays the term “FansOnly” in different settings and a logo similar to Complainant’s, and also offers the creator-focused coin (a form of cryptocurrency) “\$FOC”.

On May 30, 2025, Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent which remained unanswered.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. Notably, Complainant contends that its social media platform at “www.onlyfans.com” is one of the most popular websites in the world with more than 305 million registered users, which has become a prime target for cyber-squatters wishing to profit from the goodwill that Complainant has garnered in its ONLYFANS trademark.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is at least confusingly similar to Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark, as it consists of a reversal of the latter with the insertion of the descriptive term “coin”. Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) Respondent has no connection or affiliation with Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the ONLYFANS trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner, (2) Respondent is not commonly known by the ONLYFANS trademark and does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name, (3) Complainant has achieved global fame and success in a short time which makes it clear that Respondent knew thereof, (4) Respondent cannot claim the right to use the disputed domain name under fair use since it includes the ONLYFANS trademark and the additional descriptive term “coin” which creates a risk of implied affiliation by falsely suggesting to users that the cryptocurrency “coin” offered at the disputed domain name is provided by Complainant, and (5) the website at the disputed domain name uses a color scheme similar to

Complainant's website while also naming the creator-focused crypto coin "\$FOC". Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since (1) the disputed domain name was registered long after Complainant attained registered rights in the ONLYFANS trademark, (2) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's widely known ONLYFANS trademark, (3) Respondent is a serial cyber-squatter given that the website at the disputed domain name is extremely similar to a website in another UDRP proceeding which involved the very same domain name as in these proceedings, and (4) Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic from Complainant's website to a website offering cryptocurrency using a recognizable form of Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

First, 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 Complainant's ONLYFANS 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its ONLYFANS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Also, the entirety of such trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name in a reverse order by switching the terms "only" and "fans" to create "fanonly" instead of "onlyfans" and also adding the term "coin". Accordingly, Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark is at least still recognizable within the disputed domain name, and, therefore, the latter is confusingly similar to this trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of another term (here, the term "coin") 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 Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, holds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Second, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

In particular, Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant’s undisputedly well-known ONLYFANS trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondent’s name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name and Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the terms “onlyfans” and/or “fansonly” and/or “fansonlycoin” on its own. Quite to the contrary, the disputed domain name resolves to a website at “www.fansonlycoin.com”, which operates an influencer marketplace set up in a color scheme similar to the one used by Complainant, prominently displays the term “FansOnly” in different settings and also offers the creator-focused coin (a form of cryptocurrency) “\$FOC”. Such use of the disputed domain name, which obviously attempts to unduly profit from the undisputed recognition which Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark has acquired, therefore, neither qualifies as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of the Policy. Finally, noting that the website under the disputed domain name has the same look and feel as Complainant’s official website and prominently displays both the term “FansOnly” which is similar to Complainant’s well-known ONLYFANS trademark and a logo similar to the one used by Complainant, the Panel finds that by registering and using the disputed domain name Respondent intended to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated or endorsed by Complainant.

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

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Third, 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.

The circumstances of this case leave no doubts that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant’s rights in its well-known ONLYFANS trademark when registering the disputed domain name and that the latter is clearly directed thereto. Moreover, using the disputed domain name to operate an influencer marketplace set up in a color scheme similar to the one used by Complainant, prominently displaying the term “FansOnly” (which is similar to Complainant’s well-known ONLYFANS trademark) in different settings and also offering the creator-focused coin (a form of cryptocurrency) “\$FOC”, all of this without any authorization to do so, is a clear indication that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel, therefore, holds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

## **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, <fansonlycoin.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

*/Stephanie G. Hartung/*

**Stephanie G. Hartung**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 30, 2025