

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Name Redacted Unai Mendez  
Case No. D2026-1269

### 1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Name Redacted<sup>1</sup> Italy, and Unai Mendez, Spain.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <en-us-onlyfans.com> and <us-onlyfans.com> are registered with Register SPA. The disputed domain name <onlyfans1.org> is registered with Nominalia Internet S.L. (the “Registrars”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 25, 2026. On March 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verifications in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 26, 2026, and March 31, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 April 7, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 12, 2026.

---

<sup>1</sup> The record indicates that the name and contact details used for this registration belong to a third party who appears to have been listed without that person’s knowledge or authorization. Considering this potential identity theft, the Panel directs that the Respondents’ name be omitted from the published version of this Decision. An annex containing instructions to the Registrar, including the registrant data needed to implement this Decision, is authorized for transmission to the Registrar only and shall not be published, having regard to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See, e.g., *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

On April 7, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Italian, English, and Spanish, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <onlyfans1.org> is Spanish and the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain names for <en-us-onlyfans.com> and <us-onlyfans.com> is Italian. On April 12, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 Respondents of the Complaint in English, Italian and Spanish, and the proceedings commenced on April 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 12, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir as the sole panelist in this matter on May 21, 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 company incorporated in the United Kingdom that owns and operates the subscription-based social media platform "OnlyFans".

The Complainant is the owner of the well-known ONLYFANS trademarks, registered in various jurisdictions, including ONLYFANS Trade Mark registered in the European Union on January 9, 2019, under registration number 017912377 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42 of the International Classification ("IC"), ONLYFANS trademark registered in the United Kingdom on January 9, 2019, under registration number UK00917912377 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42, and ONLYFANS trademark registered in the United States on June 4, 2019, under registration number 5769267 for services in classes 35 of the IC ("ONLYFANS trademark").

The Complainant operates its online platform primarily through its official website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com>, which was registered on January 29, 2013. The Complainant has used the ONLYFANS trademark in connection with its social media and creator subscription platform since at least July 4, 2016. Through the platform, content creators are able to share and monetize digital content with subscribers worldwide. The OnlyFans platform has become one of the most popular websites globally, with more than 305 million registered users.

The disputed domain names were all registered on December 14, 2025. The registrants used email addresses following a similar naming pattern and appear to have provided false or fictitious contact details. The disputed domain names <us-onlyfans.com> and <onlyfans1.org> resolve to active websites that imitate the Complainant's official platform by reproducing elements associated with the ONLYFANS trademark and branding, including a modified "OF" logo and a copyright notice falsely referring to "OnlyFans". The disputed domain name <en-us-onlyfans.com> is currently suspended by the Registrar due to lack of email verification.

## **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:

(i) it owns and operates the highly popular website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com> and has used this domain name for several years in connection with the provision of its subscription-based social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web. In 2026, the Complainant's website <onlyfans.com> is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users, and its ONLYFANS trademark has been recognized by previous UDRP panels as being internationally well-known among the relevant public.

(ii) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar and effectively identical to its ONLYFANS trademark, as they incorporate the ONLYFANS mark in its entirety. The disputed domain names simply combine the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark with the geographic prefixes "en" and "us", or the numerical suffix "1", which does not change the ONLYFANS trademark so significantly that the average consumer would believe the websites associated with the disputed domain names are from a different source.

(iii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or consented to the Respondents' use of its ONLYFANS trademarks. The Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names. There can be no legitimate business reason for the Respondents to register or use domain names incorporating the Complainant's famous ONLYFANS trademark. The Complainant further argues that the Respondents operate the active websites created under the disputed domain names <us-onlyfans.com> and <onlyfans1.org> to run a fraudulent copycat OnlyFans platform in direct competition with the Complainant's subscription services offerings. The Respondents prominently display a re-colored "OF" logo to reinforce a false impression of association, which can never confer rights or legitimate interests.

(iv) The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. They resolve to websites that closely resemble the Complainant's official platform and falsely present themselves as affiliated with or operated by the Complainant. By incorporating the ONLYFANS trademark in its entirety and using it on copycat websites designed to collect users' login credentials and personal data, the Respondents are intentionally seeking to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Complainant submits that users are diverted from its genuine platform and misled by elements such as a false copyright notice stating "© Copyright 2026 OnlyFans All Rights Reserved". It further asserts that the Respondents targeted its well-known mark, used inaccurate or fictitious registrant details under the names of well-known fashion designers, provided unrelated third-party addresses, concealed its identity through privacy services, and failed to respond to the cease-and-desist letter dated January 8, 2026. These circumstances, taken together, support a finding of registration and use in bad faith under the Policy.

### **B. Respondents**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1. Procedural Issues

#### A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for <onlyfans1.org> is Spanish, while the language of the Registration Agreements for <en-us-onlyfans.com> and <us-onlyfans.com> is Italian. In accordance with paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, and in the absence of any agreement between the Parties, the language of the administrative proceeding is, as a general rule, the language of the Registration Agreement, unless the Panel determines otherwise.

The Complaint was submitted in English. The Complainant requested that English be adopted as the language of the proceeding, noting in particular that the disputed domain names incorporate English terms (“only” and “fans”) as well as English-language geographic abbreviations (“en” and “us”). The Complainant further submitted that the websites associated with <us-onlyfans.com> and <onlyfans1.org> are operated entirely in English, suggesting that the Respondents are able to understand and communicate in that language. It was also argued that requiring translation into Italian and Spanish would cause unnecessary delay and additional cost. The Respondents did not comment on or oppose the request and did not participate in the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, the Panel must ensure that the determination of the language of the proceeding is fair to both Parties and takes into account all relevant circumstances, including the Parties’ ability to understand the proposed language, as well as considerations of procedural efficiency and cost, consistent with section 4.5.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”).

Having considered the circumstances of the case, the Panel determines that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

#### B. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant’s request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant’s request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that consolidation is appropriate in the circumstances of this case.

The record shows that all three disputed domain names were registered on December 14, 2025. While this fact alone is not conclusive, the simultaneous registration of the disputed domain names is a relevant circumstance supporting an inference of common control. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were registered through the Registrars, Nominalia Internet S.L. and Register S.p.A. The available evidence indicates that these Registrars belong to the same corporate group and share the same abuse contact telephone number, which suggests a degree of connection between the registrations.

Additional support for common control arises from the manner in which the disputed domain names have been used. The websites associated with <us-onlyfans.com> and <onlyfans1.org> display highly similar content, structure, and overall presentation, including the use of a modified version of the Complainant's "OF" logo and the offering of substantially the same creator registration services.

The registrant information also exhibits notable similarities. Two of the registrant names correspond to well-known fashion designers, while the email addresses associated with all three registrations follow a strikingly similar naming convention consisting of a personal name combined with numbers and letters. The Panel further notes that the address associated with the registrant of one of the disputed domain names appears to correspond to an unrelated commercial entity rather than the named registrant. This circumstance is consistent with a broader pattern suggesting that inaccurate or fictitious registration details may have been used.

Viewed cumulatively, these circumstances support the conclusion, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

## **6.2. Substantive Issues**

### **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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark is widely known and internationally well-known among the relevant public (see *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#)).

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 geographic prefixes "en" and/or "us", the numerical suffix "1", and hyphens, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) ".com" and ".org" are disregarded under the first element test as standard technical registration requirements (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1). Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

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.

There is no evidence in the case file or otherwise apparent to the Panel that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Respondent has failed to provide any substantive reply to the Complaint, and accordingly failed to prove that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

As there is no evidence that the Respondent is in any way authorized by the Complainant to use the ONLYFANS trademarks, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent has made any bona fide, fair or otherwise legitimate use of ONLYFANS trademarks, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to use the disputed domain names which include the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademarks.

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 registered the disputed domain names long after the Complainant had established rights in the ONLYFANS trademark. The disputed domain names each incorporate the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, together with non-distinctive additional elements. The record further shows that two of the disputed domain names <onlyfans1.org> and <us-onlyfans.com> resolved to websites prominently displaying the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark and a modified version of the Complainant’s “OF” logo. In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain names.

The evidence also shows that the websites associated with <onlyfans1.org> and <us-onlyfans.com> were used in a manner likely to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. The websites reproduced the Complainant’s trademark, displayed visual elements resembling those used by the Complainant, and included a copyright notice referring to “OnlyFans”. The Panel finds that such use was intended to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and to attract Internet users to the Respondent’s websites. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the services offered thereon within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here passing off, , constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes that the websites associated with <onlyfans1.org> and

<us-onlyfans.com> purported to offer services connected with the Complainant while prominently using the Complainant's trademark and related branding elements. The Panel finds that such use amounts to a form of passing off and constitutes evidence of bad faith under the Policy.

With respect to <en-us-onlyfans.com, UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name <en-us-onlyfans.com>, the Respondent's use of false contact details, and the Respondent's failure to submit a Response and its conduct in relation to the other disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name <en-us-onlyfans.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel further notes that the Respondent did not submit a Response and has not provided any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain names. The Panel also notes the composition of the disputed domain names and the manner in which they have been used.

Finally, the Panel notes that the registrant information associated with the disputed domain names exhibits a number of unusual features, including the apparent use of names corresponding to well-known public figures and contact details whose accuracy is open to question. While not determinative on its own, this circumstance provides further support for the Panel's finding that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith.

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 <en-us-onlyfans.com>, <onlyfans1.org>, and <us-onlyfans.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mladen Vukmir/*

**Mladen Vukmir**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2026