

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. junya nakamura
Case No. D2025-4746

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is junya nakamura, Japan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfans07.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 17, 2025. On November 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 17, 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 19, 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 19, 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 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Uwa Ohiku as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 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 provides social media platform services which allow users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content, including adult entertainment content, on the Internet, under the name “OnlyFans” and through the website located at its <onlyfans.com> domain name, which it registered on January 29, 2013.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations amongst others around the world:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00917912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1507723 for ONLYFANS, registered on November 2, 2019;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 5769267 for ONLYFANS, registered on June 4, 2019.

Previous UDRP panels have recognized the Complainant’s trademark as internationally well-known amongst the relevant public. See *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#). According to submitted information and evidence, and limited Panel research, the Complainant’s rights in its ONLYFANS trademark have also been recognized and upheld by numerous prior UDRP Panel decisions, which ordered the cancellations and/or transfers of the disputed domain names to the Complainant. See *Fenix International Limited v. Withheld for Privacy Purpose, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Leon Key*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3132](#); *Fenix International Limited v. Nicolas Landry*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0881](#), et al.

The Respondent is an individual located in Japan.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 2, 2025. According to submitted evidence, at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain resolved to a website featuring adult entertainment content and at the time of Panel decision, this position is unchanged.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied all three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name (that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has established rights; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith), and provides copious information and documentary evidence by way of several annexures and references to numerous previous UDRP panel decisions in support of its contentions in this Complaint.

The Complainant also asserts that it sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on September 29, 2025, before filing the Complaint but did not hear back from the Respondent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any other rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

The Respondent failed to file a response to the Complainant’s assertions, but this does not automatically mean that the Complainant has established all three elements (enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy) for a transfer of the disputed domain name, and the Panel has a responsibility to review all the relevant evidence and annexed materials provided in the Complaint to verify that all three elements are indeed established. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.3.

In discharging its responsibility, the Panel also has authority to carry out limited independent research under the general powers of the Panel, amongst others, specified in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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 3.0”](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of trademarks or service marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the Complainant’s mark is reproduced and 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.

Further, the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity as this is a standard registration requirement. The Panel also finds that the addition of other terms, here, “07”, 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 the following circumstances by which a Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name:

- that before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name or;
- that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the 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, as in this case, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Complainant's un rebutted assertions, the preponderance of evidence submitted as annexures to the Complaint, and the failure of the Respondent to come forward to establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise, 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 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 the following, amongst several other facts and evidence provided:

- that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant had started using and registered its trademarks and well after the Complainant's services became well established and known and, in the circumstances, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent can feign ignorance of the Complainant; given the popularity of the website exploited under the trademarks ONLYFANS and ONLYFANS.COM. which have been recognized in numerous previous UDRP proceedings as internationally well known amongst the relevant public (*Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#)).

- that the Respondent knew or should have known of the registration and use of the trademarks of the Complainant prior to registering the disputed domain name and a basic search of publicly available records would have revealed the Complainant's earlier rights in the ONLYFANS trademark;

- that previous UDRP panels have consistently held that the registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely known trademark, as in this case, creates a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.;

- that further compounding the Complainant's assertion of bad faith registration and use against the Respondent, is the fact that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name resumes to a website that provides products and services directly competing with those of the Complainant;

- that the Respondent did not reply to the cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant prior to the proceeding;

- that the Respondent's use of a privacy shield, in addition to the Respondent's failure to file a response to Complainant assertions, can be upheld as further evidence of bad faith on the part of the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.6.

In the Panel's view, given all the foregoing and the preponderance of the Complainant's undisputed evidence, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, capitalizing on the goodwill attached to the Complainant's trademarks, and disrupting the Complainant's business, all acts falling particularly within paragraph 4(b)(iii) and (iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under 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 <onlyfans07.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Uwa Ohiku/

Uwa Ohiku

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026