

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. edenilson oliveira

Case No. D2025-5075

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is edenilson oliveira, Brazil.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <premiumonlyfans.site> and <Onlyfans.site> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 5, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 9, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED / NO DATA PROVIDED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 9, 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 December 10, 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 December 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 18, 2026.

The Center appointed William Lobelson as the sole panelist in this matter on January 20, 2026. 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 Fenix International Limited. It exploits a social media platform “onlyfans.com” that allows users to post and subscribe to audio-visual content intended to adults. The Complainant contends that it counts around 300 million registered users.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for ONLYFANS, inter alia:

European Union Trade Mark No. 017912377 and 017946559, registered on January 9, 2019;

United States Registration Nos. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019, and 6253455, registered on January 26, 2021.

The disputed domain names are:

<Onlyfans.site>, registered on September 16, 2025;

<premiumonlyfans.site>, registered on September 22, 2025.

Both are directed to a web page dedicated to adult entertainment content subscription services.

The Complainant served a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on October 14, 2025, to which no response was brought.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its earlier trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names have been registered and used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Notwithstanding the default of the Respondent, it remains incumbent on the Complainant to make out its case in all respects under the Rules set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Namely, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (paragraph 4(a)(i));

- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(a)(ii)); and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii)).

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 Complainant's trademark is ONLYFANS.

The Panel finds the said mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name <Onlyfans.site> despite the misspelling consisting in replacing the first letter "o" with the digit "0".

Accordingly, the disputed domain name <Onlyfans.site> is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

Concerning the disputed domain name <premiumonlyfans.site>, although the addition of the term "premium" to the Complainant's trademark 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 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 names.

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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 registered the two disputed domain names, that are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, to direct them to a web site that offers services that are competing with the Complainant.

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.

Examples of what may be cumulative circumstances found to be indicative of bad faith include the complainant having a well-known trademark, no response to the complaint having been filed, and the respondent's concealment of its identity. UDRP panels may draw inferences about whether a domain name was used in bad faith given the circumstances surrounding the registration.

The Complainant has contended that its trademark ONLYFANS, which has been registered and used for years on a worldwide level, now benefits from a certain level of public awareness.

Earlier UDRP decisions have acknowledged the rights vested in the said trademark and the reputation thereof (*Fenix International Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#)).

Regarding the confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's well-known trademark ONLYFANS, it is apparent that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

The Panel further observes that the Respondent directed the disputed domain names to web pages dedicated to adult entertainment, namely services that are identical to the Complainant, thus revealing that he had the Complainant's trademark in mind when he registered the disputed domain names.

The Panel infers from the above that the Respondent acted in bad faith when he registered the disputed domain names.

It is further noted that the Respondent did not respond to the cease-and-desist letter he was served by the Complainant, but redirected one to the two disputed domain names to another page.

And, as indicated earlier, that both disputed domain names were used in relation with services that directly compete with the Complainant.

For this Panel, the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in order to unduly benefit from the Complainant's reputation and divert Internet traffic from the Complainant's website to its own web pages dedicated to adult entertainment content subscription services.

Such use is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4

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 names <premiumonlyfans.site> and <Onlyfans.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William Lobelson/

William Lobelson

Sole Panelist

Date: January 26, 2026