ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Fenix International Limited v. wu chen, ruby
Case No. D2026-0808

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is wu chen, ruby, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansx.xyz> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 25, 2026. On February 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 26, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 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 27, 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 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant owns and operates the website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com> for a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the web. According to the Complainant, in 2026 the Complainant's website is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant has registered several trademarks consisting of ONLYFANS, including the European Union Trade Mark No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019, covering goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42, and the International trademark No. 1507723, registered on November 2, 2019, covering goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 13, 2025 and according to evidence with the Complaint, it was used to resolve to a website for "A web3 creator ecosystem". At the date of the Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

No information is available on the Respondent apart from the data revealed by the Registrar.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 8, 2026, and the Respondent did not reply.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark with the only difference being the insertion of the letter "x" after the Complainant's trademark, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use its trademarks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered on October 13, 2025, long after the Complainant attained registered rights in its trademarks and long after the Complainant had common law rights in its trademarks which had acquired distinctiveness. Further, the Complainant contends that the Complainant's trademarks have been recognized in numerous previous UDRP proceedings as "internationally well-known amongst the relevant public" such that the Respondent either knew or ought to have known of the Complainant's trademarks and likely registered the disputed domain name to target such trademarks.

As regards the use, the Complainant contends that the Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant's website to a website offering links to cryptocurrency for

"creators" and "fans" while using the Complainant's trademarks. Furthermore, according to the Complainant, the footer of the website at the disputed domain name contains a copyright statement as follows: "©2025-OnlyFans X", which shows bad faith use and registration as the copyright statement creates an impression of a website associated with the Complainant. In addition, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 8, 2026 demanding the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name and the Respondent did not respond, thus necessitating the filing of this Complaint. The Respondent's use of a privacy service combined with a failure to submit a response is additional evidence of bad faith registration.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Accordingly, the Panel considers it can proceed to determine the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant as per paragraph 15(a) of the Rules. The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3.

Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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.

The Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1, and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark ONLYFANS for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here the letter "x") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letter does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, 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 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 3.1, section 2.1.

It appears that the disputed domain name was used without permission to divert traffic to a website most likely for commercial gain as described above. The Panel does not find this to be a legitimate or bona fide conduct. Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute a fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. See section 2.5.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

The Respondent is named "wu chen, ruby", as was disclosed by the Registrar, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

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 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 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant's registration and use of the relevant trademarks predate the date at which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and its inclusion in not only the disputed domain name but also on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, it is more likely than not that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, and to target those trademarks. The disputed domain name was used by the Respondent to direct to a website offering services that appear to be in direct competition with the services offered by the Complainant. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the

Respondent's website (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4). Moreover, the website at the disputed domain name includes a misleading copyright notice, which tends to falsely indicate an affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant. The use of a privacy service also supports a finding of bad faith registration and use in the circumstances of the case.

The fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website does not change the Panel's findings.

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 <onlyfansx.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/
Mihaela Maravela
Sole Panelist
Date: March 31, 2026