

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. gursel yildirim  
Case No. D2025-5205

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Fenix International Limited, United States of America, represented by Walters Law Group, United States of America.

The Respondent is gursel yildirim, Cyprus

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

The disputed domain name <crepsonlyfans.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 12, 2025. On December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 15, 2026, 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 Purposes Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 16, 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 15, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on January 23, 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 owns and operates a social media platform at the domain name <onlyfans.com> - registered on January 29, 2013 – that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for ONLYFANS, including the following, as per trademark registration certificates submitted as annex C to the Complaint:

- European Union trademark registration No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS (word mark), filed on June 5, 2018, and registered on January 9, 2019, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- European Union trademark registration No. 017946559 for ONLYFANS (figurative mark), filed on August 22, 2018, and registered on January 9, 2019, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 5769267 for ONLYFANS (word mark), filed on October 29, 2018, and registered on June 4, 2019, in international class 35.
- United States trademark registration No. 6253455 for ONLYFANS (word mark), filed on November 02, 2019, and registered on January 26, 2021, in international classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name <crepsonlyfans.com> was registered on September 12, 2025, and is redirected to a website promoting adult content, which appears to be shared on linked Telegram accounts referenced on the website.

#### **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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly to the trademark ONLYFANS in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the descriptive term “creps” and of the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) “.com”, both of which do not sufficiently distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s trademark.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is in no way connected or affiliated with the Complainant nor has it ever received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is also not commonly known by the disputed domain name and does not hold any trademarks for the terms encompassed in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent does not have any legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as the Respondent has been pointing the disputed domain name to a website offering adult entertainment services in direct competition with Complainant’s services, including “providing entertainment services ... in the nature of a website featuring non-downloadable video, photographs, images, audio ... in the field of adult entertainment.”

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that, considering i) the disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant attained registered rights in its ONLYFANS trademark and long after the Complainant accrued common law rights in the trademark which had acquired distinctiveness; ii) the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's widely known trademark and iii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect users to a website providing services in direct competition with the Complainant, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark and used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of its website.

The Complainant also states that it sent cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on October 15, 2025, to which the Respondent did not reply, and concludes that the Respondent's lack of reply further demonstrates of its bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the 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.

### **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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of national and regional trademark registrations for ONLYFANS. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ONLYFANS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the mere addition of the descriptive term "creps", which 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.

As to the gTLD ".com", it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s trademarks. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s rights and legitimate interests over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to resolve Internet users to a website providing services in direct competition with the Complainant does not amount to bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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 finds that, in light of the prior registration and use of the trademark ONLYFANS in connection with the Complainant’s social media platform at “www.onlyfans.com” and considering the widely known character of the Complainant’s trademark, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the ONLYFANS mark in its entirety and is pointed to a website promoting adult content entertainment services supports the conclusion that the Respondent was actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration.

In view of the above-described use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website and the services provided therein, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and to the Complaint further supports the conclusion that the Respondent acted in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

## **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 <crepsonlyfans.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Luca Barbero/*

**Luca Barbero**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2026