

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Emily Smith, mm
Case No. D2025-4660

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Emily Smith, mm, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <en-onlyfans.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 November 10, 2025. On November 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 12, 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 November 13, 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 November 13, 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 November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Anton Polikarpov as the sole panelist in this matter on December 17, 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 well-established company, operating internationally in the field of online subscription-based digital content platforms. Over the years, it has developed a globally recognized service, particularly within the adult content sector, enabling photo and video creators to distribute exclusive materials to paying subscribers.

The Complainant's brand has become closely associated with its proprietary platform and is now protected as an intellectual property asset in various jurisdictions, notably:

- European Union Trademark No. 017912377 for **ONLYFANS**, registered on January 9, 2019, covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42;
- European Union Trademark No. 017946559 for , registered on January 9, 2019, covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42;
- United Kingdom Trademark No. UK00917912377 for **ONLYFANS**, registered on January 9, 2019, covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42;
- United States Trademark No. 5769267 for , registered on June 4, 2019, covering services in Class 35;
- International Trademark No. 1682437 for  OnlyFans, registered on February 18, 2022, covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42; and
- United States Trademark No. 6918293 for , registered on December 6, 2022, covering goods in Class 9.

The trademarks are used consistently across the Complainant's commercial activities, including through its primary domain name <onlyfans.com>, as well as on its websites, applications, and associated promotional services.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on September 30, 2025 to which it received no response.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 16, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint and this Decision, it resolves to an active website prominently displaying the ONLYFANS figurative mark and logo and using the same white and blue colour scheme as the Complainant's official site. The website purports to offer users the ability to share and access photos and videos after creating an account and/or subscribing.

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, namely:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has established rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must prove all three elements described in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

The Respondent had an opportunity to submit a Response addressing the Complaint and providing supporting evidence to retain the registration of the disputed domain name, but did not do so.

According to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, "if a Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint". Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that "if a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, these Rules or any request from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate".

The Panel finds as follows.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has duly shown its registered rights to the ONLYFANS marks in multiple jurisdictions. For the purposes of standing under the Policy, the Complainant has demonstrated rights in the ONLYFANS mark, which is sufficient to satisfy the threshold requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1).

As to a side-by-side comparison, the disputed domain name incorporates the ONLYFANS mark in its entirety. The addition of the prefix "en" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (see the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8; *N. M. Rothschild & Sons Limited v. Shelley Cole, ccadilo int*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1439](#); and *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC / Dat Nguyen*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3179](#)).

The inclusion of a generic Top-Level Domain (".com") is a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded when comparing a domain name with a trademark (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, so the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

On this matter, the Complainant noted:

- the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization to use its trademarks within the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the ONLYFANS marks or by the disputed domain name;
- the website at the disputed domain name is designed to look like the authentic one and arranges for subscriptions to third-party adult content in direct competition with the Complainant's registered services;
- it is very probable that an Internet user might be misled into thinking that the webpage at the disputed domain name is related to or even operated by the Complainant.

In the Panel's view, the Complainant has established a prima facie case. In such a situation, it is well accepted that the burden of production on this element shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1).

However, the Respondent failed to describe any reason set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise or provide credible supporting evidence .

The Panel notes that the website header and footer incorporate the ONLYFANS mark, and the overall look and feel, using the same blue and white colour scheme, is similar to the Complainant's authentic website, including the reproduction of the Complainant's copyright notice.

Besides, the website currently hosted at the disputed domain name features the ONLYFANS brand history, mission, vision, values, and allegedly names of the company employees.

It appears, noting the absence of any explanatory information regarding the connection of the Respondent (or lack thereof) with the Complainant, that the disputed domain name, consisting of the ONLYFANS mark and the prefix "en," directs users to an active copycat website misleading Internet users as to the affiliation or endorsement of the website.

Although previous panels have assessed the rights of distributors in certain circumstances, in this case the Respondent cannot benefit from the Oki Data framework (see e.g., *Virgin Enterprises Limited v. Eby Chukwu*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3379](#); *Canva Pty Ltd. v. William Hurrell, Hurrell Capital Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3521](#)).

Given this, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, therefore the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is met.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

As to registration: the ONLYFANS marks are highly distinctive and enjoy global fame. The registration dates back to 2019, and the Complainant has operated its authentic website through the domain name <onlyfans.com> since 2013.

In addition, the well-known character of the ONLYFANS marks amongst the relevant public was confirmed by multiple UDRP panel decisions (see e.g., *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#); and *Fenix International Limited v. Host Master, 1337 Services LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2652](#)).

As to use: the case file shows that the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's mark resolves to a website mimicking the look and feel of the Complainant's site, which does not amount to fair use.

The website appears to invite users to register and provide personal and potentially payment information; however, the website does not include any Terms of Service or Privacy Policy. There is also no contact information available to reach the Respondent, apart from the reproduction of the Complainant's copyright notice.

It appears that the Respondent had a clear intention to use the Complainant's trademarks and goodwill for the purpose of attracting Internet users to its website at the disputed domain name for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

The lack of a response to the Complainant's cease and desist letter reinforces the already compelling arguments in the Complaint (see *Compagnie Generale Des Etablissements Michelin v. Vaclav Novotny*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1022](#)).

In light of the above, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the final element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <en-onlyfans.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anton Polikarpov /

Anton Polikarpov

Sole Panelist

Date: December 31, 2025