

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. snow tkn
Case No. D2026-0737

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is snow tkn, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfanspage.online> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Sav.com, LLC (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) 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 February 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter J. Dernbach as the sole panelist in this matter on March 30, 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 a provider of an online social media platform that allows Internet users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content, which platform is operated under its official domain name <onlyfans.com> (the “Complainant’s Platform”).

The Complainant owns several registered trademarks for the word mark ONLYFANS in, inter alia, Classes 35 and 41, across various jurisdictions (the “ONLYFANS Mark(s)”), including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 5,769,267, registered on June 4, 2019 (in Class 35, regarding the service “arranging subscriptions of the online publications of others”), first used on July 4, 2016;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 6,253,455, registered on January 26, 2021;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019; and
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00917912377, registered on January 9, 2019.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on October 16, 2025. According to the evidence, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website that appears to be a platform for creators to post and supporters to subscribe to adult entertainment content (“the Respondent’s Website”). The Respondent’s Website displays “OnlyFans” on its homepage and appears to provide “sign up” and “log in” options for users, which is similar to the Complainant’s Platform.

The Respondent is identified as snow tkn, with an address in United States.

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.

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant contends that it has established both registered rights and unregistered common law rights in its ONLYFANS Marks. The Complainant further asserts that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademarks because it incorporates the ONLYFANS Mark in its entirety. The Complainant argues that the addition of the descriptive word “page” and the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) “.online” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant, nor has the Respondent received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the ONLYFANS Marks in the Disputed Domain Name or in any other manner. Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the ONLYFANS Marks and does not hold any trademark for the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent is not entitled to claim fair use, since it includes the ONLYFANS Mark in the Disputed Domain Name in its entirety.

with the additional term “page”, creating a risk of implied affiliation by suggesting to users that the Respondent’s Website is an official site or method to create an OnlyFans “page”. The Complainant particularly notes that the Respondent’s Website arranges for subscriptions to adult content in direct competition with the Complainant’s registered services in International Class 35 of “arranging subscriptions of the online publications of others”, which does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, noting that the Complainant’s registered rights and unregistered common law rights in the ONLYFANS Marks long predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name and its ONLYFANS Marks are internationally well-known. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent either knew or ought to have known of the ONLYFANS Marks and likely registered the Disputed Domain Name to target the ONLYFANS Marks. The Complaint also alleges that the Respondent used the ONLYFANS Mark and the additional term “page” within the Disputed Domain Name, which enhances the likelihood of confusion. Furthermore, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name to offer adult entertainment content subscription services in direct competition with the Complainant, diverting Internet traffic from the Complainant’s Platform to the Respondent’s Website. Finally, the Respondent did not respond to Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter, and hid itself from the public behind a Whois privacy wall.

The Complainant further contends that use in bad faith should be found as the Disputed Domain Name directs to a commercial website that offers adult entertainment subscription services in direct competition with the Complainant’s services. This is clearly an 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 Name, which is use in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established its rights in the ONLYFANS Marks through showing registrations of the ONLYFANS Marks in the United States, the European Union, and the United Kingdom.

The Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark as the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the ONLYFANS Mark in its entirety. The addition of the term “page” does not prevent such finding. Furthermore, the gTLD “.online” is disregarded in the assessment of similarity, following standard UDRP practice.

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 that 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 2.1.

In the present case, the Complainant has asserted that it has no connection or affiliation with the Respondent. The Complainant also states that it has never authorized, licensed, or consented to the Respondent’s use the ONLYFANS Mark in the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, there is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent—whose name is “snow tkn”, as revealed by the Registrar—is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel does not find any sign of the Respondent’s bona fide offering of goods or services in connection with its use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to the Respondent’s Website, which appears to offer adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant. Such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent, nor does it amount to fair use.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s Website intentionally imitates certain elements of the Complainant’s Platform, since it prominently displays “OnlyFans” on its homepage and appears to provide “sign up” and “log in” functionality for users, which is similar to the Complainant’s Platform. This use does not confer rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

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. Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element of the Policy, the complainant must demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. 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.

Regarding registration, the Panel notes that the ONLYFANS Marks were registered long before the Disputed Domain Name and are internationally well-known in their industry, as panels have recognized in prior cases. Also, the Respondent’s Website offers services similar to those of the Complainant’s Platform. The Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew of or should have known of the Complainant’s ONLYFANS Marks at the time it registered the Disputed Domain Name. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered in bad faith.

Regarding use, the Respondent's Website apparently provides adult entertainment content platform services in direct competition with the Complainant. Such use would divert Internet users to the Respondent's Website for commercial gain or to disrupt the business of the Complainant, which constitutes use in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has satisfied 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 <onlyfanspage.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter J. Dernbach/

Peter J. Dernbach

Sole Panelist

Date: April 13, 2026