

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Arthuro Dns
Case No. D2026-0734

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Arthuro Dns, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfans-leaker.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 February 20, 2026. On February 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 23, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 2026, 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 February 24, 2026.

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 March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Marcello Do Nascimento as the sole panelist in this matter on April 2, 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, Fenix International Limited, operates the well-known online social media platform available at “www.onlyfans.com”. The platform enables content creators to share audiovisual content with subscribers on a paid basis and has achieved substantial global recognition. Since its launch, the Complainant has developed into one of the most prominent platforms in the digital content subscription industry, with hundreds of millions of registered users worldwide.

The Complainant’s activities encompass the provision of online subscription services, audiovisual content distribution, social networking functionalities, and related technological services. These services are offered globally and supported by significant investments in technology, branding, and intellectual property protection.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the marks ONLYFANS, ONLYFANS.COM, and related figurative marks. The record includes, inter alia, the following trademark registrations:

- European Union trademark ONLYFANS, Registration No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42 ;
- European Union trademark (figurative) ONLYFANS, Registration No. 017946559, registered on January 9, 2019, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42 ;
- United States trademark ONLYFANS, Registration No. 5,769,267, registered on June 4, 2019, in International Class 35 ;
- United States trademark ONLYFANS, Registration No. 6,253,455, registered on January 26, 2021, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42 ;
- United States trademark (figurative) ONLYFANS, Registration No. 6,253,475, registered on January 26, 2021, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42 ;
- United States figurative trademarks comprising the stylized OF logo, including Registration Nos. 6,918,293, 6,918,294, 6,938,572, and 6,938,573, registered between 2022 and 2023.

The disputed domain name <onlyfans-leaker.com> was registered on September 30, 2025.

The evidence on record shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering access to allegedly “leaked” or pirated content associated with the Complainant’s platform, including links to third-party channels such as Telegram.

The record further shows that, prior to initiating this proceeding, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 7, 2026, asserting its trademark rights and demanding, inter alia, the immediate cessation of infringing activities and the cancellation of the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not reply to this communication.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are fully satisfied and that the disputed domain name should therefore be transferred to it.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known ONLYFANS trademark. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name incorporates the ONLYFANS mark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the term “leaker”.

The Complainant argues that the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, the term “leaker” reinforces the association with the Complainant’s services, as it refers to the unauthorized distribution of content, which is directly related to the Complainant’s business model and platform.

The Complainant further submits that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” should be disregarded when comparing the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark.

With respect to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the ONLYFANS trademark.

According to the Complainant, there is no relationship between the Parties that could justify the Respondent’s registration or use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering access to allegedly “leaked” or pirated content associated with the Complainant’s platform, including links to third-party services such as Telegram channels. The Complainant argues that such use is manifestly illegitimate and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name seeks to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill associated with the ONLYFANS trademark and creates a misleading impression that the website is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It emphasizes that its trademark rights significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name and that the ONLYFANS mark enjoys substantial international recognition.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent’s deliberate selection of a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s distinctive trademark together with a term directly related to unauthorized content distribution demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and intentionally targeted its brand.

The Complainant further relies on the fact that it sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 7, 2026, demanding the cessation of the infringing conduct and the cancellation of the disputed domain name, to which the Respondent did not reply. In the Complainant’s view, such failure to respond constitutes further evidence of bad faith.

For these reasons, the Complainant submits that the circumstances of this case fall within the examples of bad faith described in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, in particular the use of the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark.

In light of the foregoing, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit any Response to the Complaint. Accordingly, the Respondent has not contested the Complainant’s assertions nor provided any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, nor any explanation regarding its registration or use.

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted, in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants must prove, on the balance of probabilities, each of the following elements:

- a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights;
- b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- c) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel addresses each element in turn.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark ONLYFANS through numerous trademark registrations submitted in evidence, including registrations in the European Union and the United States. These include, inter alia, European Union trademark No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS and United States trademark registrations Nos. 5,769,267, and 6,253,455 for ONLYFANS.

The disputed domain name incorporates the term “onlyfans”, which corresponds directly to the Complainant’s trademark ONLYFANS. The Panel therefore considers that the Complainant’s trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

In accordance with section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), where a domain name incorporates a complainant’s trademark in its entirety, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark.

The Panel further observes that the disputed domain name includes the additional term “leaker”. The addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

As reflected in section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the addition of other terms, whether descriptive, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity where the complainant’s mark remains recognizable within the domain name.

Finally, the Panel notes that the applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.com” is generally viewed as a standard registration requirement and, as such, is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity assessment, as reflected in section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may demonstrate a respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. Although the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests may involve the difficult task of establishing a negative fact.

Accordingly, once a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to present evidence demonstrating otherwise. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1).

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the ONLYFANS trademark. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any name corresponding to the Complainant's trademark. Likewise, there is no indication that the Respondent owns any trademark or service mark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering access to allegedly "leaked" or unauthorized content associated with the Complainant's platform, including links to third-party channels.

In the Panel's view, such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel further considers that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark together with a term directly referring to unauthorized content dissemination, carries a risk of implied affiliation and misleadingly suggests a connection with the Complainant.

Such use, in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests.

The Respondent did not submit any Response in this proceeding and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or to demonstrate any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has therefore 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 sets out circumstances which, 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 observes that the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark had been widely used and had acquired substantial international recognition well before the registration of the disputed domain name.

Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's mark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not contested the Complainant's assertions in this regard. On that basis, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark and deliberately targeted it.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark ONLYFANS in its entirety, combined with the term "leaker". As discussed above, this term directly refers to the unauthorized disclosure or distribution of content. In the Panel's view, this composition is clearly deliberate and reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant's platform and its business model.

The evidence on record shows that the disputed domain name resolves to an active website prominently displaying the designation "onlyfansleaker" and purporting to offer access to "leaked" content attributed to creators associated with the Complainant's platform. The website includes listings of individuals, accompanied by references to photos and videos, as well as indications that such content is available for viewing or download.

The Panel notes that such content is presented in a manner suggesting that it originates from subscription-based platforms and has been made available without authorization. The website further uses language such as "leaks", "exclusive content", and references to downloadable material, thereby reinforcing the impression of unauthorized dissemination of protected content.

In the Panel's view, such use constitutes clear evidence of bad faith. As reflected in section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), panels assess the totality of the circumstances in determining bad faith. In the present case, the Respondent's conduct demonstrates a clear intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark for illegitimate purposes.

Furthermore, section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) recognizes that where a domain name is registered with knowledge of the complainant's trademark and with the intention of targeting that mark, this supports a finding of bad faith.

By using the disputed domain name to host or facilitate access to allegedly pirated content, the Respondent is clearly seeking to attract Internet users by exploiting the Complainant's trademark and reputation. Such conduct demonstrates an intent to divert users expecting to access the Complainant's services and to derive commercial or other illegitimate benefit from such confusion.

This conduct falls squarely within the circumstances described in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, namely the intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 7, 2026, to which the Respondent did not reply. While not determinative on its own, such failure to respond may reinforce an inference of bad faith in the circumstances of the case.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <onlyfans-leaker.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marcello Do Nascimento/

Marcello Do Nascimento

Sole Panelist

Date: April 16, 2026