

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Marco Nicola Messina
Case No. D2026-1284

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Marco Nicola Messina, Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfanscamgirls.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 March 25, 2026. On March 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 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 March 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 March 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 April 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Frank Schoneveld as the sole panelist in this matter on May 7, 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 the website located at the domain <onlyfans.com> and has used this domain for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web and has popular websites worldwide with more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant has registered its trademarks for ONLYFANS in a number of jurisdictions including in the European Union where the Respondent has its registered address in Italy. The Complainant provides evidence of its registration of the trademarks for ONLYFANS in (amongst other jurisdictions):

Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date
European Union	017912377	January 9, 2019
United States	5,769,267	June 4, 2019
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	UK00917946559	January 9, 2019

The disputed domain name was registered on October 30, 2025, more than five years after the Complainant registered its trademarks ONLYFANS.

The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage displaying the term “OnlyFansCamGirls”, with various links redirecting users to third-party adult content websites and offers of reduced prices for services and content similar to (or the same as) that of the Complainant.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent on January 14, 2026 demanding the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks for ONLYFANS (the “Trademarks”) since the Trademarks are recognizable within the disputed domain name and the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

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 Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Trademarks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the Trademarks and;
- the Respondent does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that once the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the burden then shifts to the Respondent to provide concrete evidence that it has rights to, or legitimate interest in, the domain name at issue, and the Respondent having failed to do so, all the evidence indicates that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that using a disputed domain name to host

commercial websites that advertise goods and services in direct competition with the trademark owner does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name not because it refers to or is associated with the Respondent, but because the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the <onlyfans.com> domain name and the Trademarks. The Complainant further contends that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, purports to allow visitors to “access and view Premium OnlyFans Accounts for free ...” so that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to offer what the Complainant alleges are illegal services, is not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered on October 30, 2025, long after the Complainant attained registered rights in the Trademarks and long after the Complainant had common law rights in its Trademarks which had acquired distinctiveness, and that registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark, creates a presumption of bad faith. The Complainant argues that because there is no benign reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name, it is clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant’s Trademarks.

The Complainant submits that the respondent was likely aware of the Complainant’s trademark rights when it registered a confusingly similar domain name and began operating a website that provides products and services in direct competition with the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the confusingly similar disputed domain name to offer services in direct competition with the Complainant including that the Respondent pirates material from the Complainant’s website and that this amounts to bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name directs to a website that offers the Complainant’s users’ content in an unauthorized manner, constituting bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also argues that the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter of January 14, 2026 demanding the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name, is further evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Select UDRP Questions (“[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. 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.

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 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.

In this regard, the Panel notes the misleading nature of, as well as the Respondent’s competing use, at the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, taking unfair commercial advantage of the Complainant’s 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, by including links at the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, to a webpage that provides the same or similar services (for monetary gain) as the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s Trademarks.

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 <onlyfanscamgirls.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Frank Schoneveld/

Frank Schoneveld

Sole Panelist

Date: May 26, 2026