

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. Elias Mia  
Case No. D2026-1338

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Elias Mia, Bangladesh..

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <onlyfansleakvideo.online> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 27, 2026. On March 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 31, 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 service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 31, 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 amended Complaint on March 31, 2026.

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 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 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Munir Suboh as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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.

The Panel notes that, at the time of notification of the Complaint on April 10, 2026, email directed to postmaster@onlyfansleakvideo.online was returned as undeliverable, the mail server associated with the disputed domain having rejected the message. Notification was also transmitted by email to the Respondent's personal email address and by post to the Respondent's postal address in Dhaka, Bangladesh. The Panel is satisfied that the Center discharged its notification obligations under the Rules.

#### 4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Fenix International Limited, is a United Kingdom corporation that owns and operates the website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com>, a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual and other content via the World Wide Web. The Complainant registered the domain name <onlyfans.com> on January 29, 2013. In 2026, "www.onlyfans.com" is noted according to various references online to be as one of the most visited websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant holds wide portfolio of registered trademark rights in the ONLYFANS mark and in multiple jurisdictions. Three representative registrations, all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name, are as follows:

- **European Union:** EUIPO Trade Mark No. EU017912377 for the word mark ONLYFANS, filed June 5, 2018, and entered in the register on January 9, 2019, covering Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42, including online subscription services and entertainment services in the nature of a website featuring non-downloadable video, photographs, images, audio, and text.
- **United Kingdom:** UKIPO Trade Mark No. UK00917912377 for the word mark ONLYFANS, filed June 5, 2018, and entered in the register on January 9, 2019, covering the same classes, the UK registration having been automatically generated upon the United Kingdom's exit from the European Union at the end of 2020.
- **United States of America:** USPTO Registration No. 5,769,267 for the word mark ONLYFANS in Class 35 (arranging subscriptions of the online publications of others), registered on June 4, 2019, with first use in commerce recorded as July 4, 2016.

The Complainant's earliest registered rights, according to the available documents to the Panel, accrued on June 5, 2018. The Complainant has additionally pursued registrations in numerous other jurisdictions worldwide.

In addition to its registered rights, the Complainant has extensive common law rights in the ONLYFANS mark throughout the world, with first use in commerce established by at least July 4, 2016. Previous WIPO UDRP panels have recognized, the Complainant's unregistered common law rights as having acquired distinctiveness by no later than July 4, 2016. See, e.g. *internationally well-known amongst the relevant public. Fenix International Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#). The Complainant's trademark rights have been recognised in over 150 other WIPO UDRP decisions, resulting in the cancellation or transfer of disputed domain names to the Complainant.

On January 8, 2026, the Complainant's counsel, Walters Law Group, sent a cease-and-desist letter by email to the masked WHOIS registrant address associated with the disputed domain name. The letter set out the Complainant's trademark portfolio, asserted that the disputed domain name was confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks and was registered and used in bad faith, and demanded that the registrant immediately cease all use of the disputed domain name and cancel it within five days. No response was received.

The disputed domain name <onlyfansleakvideo.online> was registered on November 16, 2025, well after the Complainant's earliest registered rights accrued in June 2018, and well after the Complainant's common law rights had acquired distinctiveness in 2016. According to registrar verification data, the registrant is Elias Mia located in Bangladesh.

A screenshot captured on March 27, 2026, shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website with the browser title "Watch Popular Sex Videos HD - Free Download" and branded under the header "POPULAR SEX VIDEOS". The website displayed numerous adult content video thumbnails. The website is a commercial adult entertainment aggregator offering content in direct competition with the Complainant's services..

No information is available regarding the Respondent's business or any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. There is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor any evidence that the Respondent has received any authorisation, licence, or consent from the Complainant to use the ONLYFANS marks.

## **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 confusingly similar to its ONLYFANS marks because it incorporates the ONLYFANS mark in its entirety, with the only differences being the addition of the descriptive terms "leak" and "video" after the mark and the use of the ".online" top-level domain, neither of which is sufficient to avoid confusing similarity. The Complainant relies on WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.8, and cites several prior panel decisions involving domain names incorporating the ONLYFANS mark together with similar descriptive terms.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, having no connection with or authorisation from the Complainant, not being commonly known by the disputed domain name, and operating the disputed domain name in connection with a website that offers adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It argues that bad faith registration is established by the registration of the disputed domain name long after the Complainant's marks had acquired widespread international recognition, creating a presumption that the Respondent registered the domain with knowledge of the Complainant's marks and intent to exploit them. Bad faith use is established by the Respondent's operation of the disputed domain name to direct internet users to a commercial adult entertainment website that competes directly with the Complainant, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant further relies on the Respondent's failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letter of January 8, 2026, the Respondent's use of a WHOIS privacy service, and the Respondent's failure to participate in these proceedings as additional evidence of bad faith, citing [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.6 and 4.3.

The Complainant requests that the Panel order transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish all three of the following elements:

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
3. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate.

### **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 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 Complainant holds multiple registered trademarks for the ONLYFANS mark. The Complainant's rights in the ONLYFANS mark are well-established and not in dispute.

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 disputed domain name <onlyfansleakvideo.online> incorporates the ONLYFANS mark in full and without modification. The ONLYFANS mark is plainly recognisable as the dominant element of the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms here, "leak" and "video" 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

As to the ".online" top-level domain, the applicable TLD is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The record discloses no indication that the Respondent has any connection with or authorisation from the Complainant to use the ONLYFANS marks. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. There is no evidence of any demonstrable preparations for or any bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i). The website at the disputed domain name is a commercial adult entertainment aggregator offering content in direct competition with the Complainant’s services — including providing entertainment services in the nature of a website featuring non-downloadable video, photographs, images, and audio in the field of adult entertainment — under the ONLYFANS mark. Such use creates a false impression of association with or endorsement by the Complainant and cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i), nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii). *Fenix International Limited v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard Inc. / Genadiy Ivanov*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0828](#); *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org / Kelly Smit, onlyfansleak*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2706](#).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for passing off or operating a copycat site can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. The Respondent’s website falsely trades on the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s internationally well-known ONLYFANS mark to divert internet users to a competing commercial adult entertainment platform. The Panel finds that such use cannot give rise to any rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

From the evidence that were reviewed, 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 and from the evidence provided in the Complaint, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s ONLYFANS mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s mark in full together with terms directly descriptive of the content hosted at the Respondent’s website, is used to direct Internet users to a commercial adult entertainment aggregator offering services in direct competition with the Complainant. Internet users encountering the disputed domain name would reasonably, but falsely, assume an association with the Complainant’s well-known ONLYFANS platform.

**Bad Faith Registration:** The disputed domain name was registered on November 16, 2025, more than seven years after the Complainant's earliest registered trademark rights accrued on June 5, 2018, and nearly a decade after the Complainant's common law rights had acquired distinctiveness in 2016. Given the international fame of the ONLYFANS mark, recognised in over 150 prior WIPO UDRP decisions, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its marks when registering the disputed domain name. Previous panels have consistently found that registration of a domain name confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark creates a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. As one panel stated in a prior case brought by this same Complainant: "Given the wholesale adoption of the Mark in the disputed domain name, it is difficult to conceive of any use that the Respondent might make of the disputed domain name without the Complainant's consent that would not involve bad faith." *Fenix International Limited v. Steven Williams, onlyfansdates*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2518](#). The Panel adopts that reasoning here. There is no plausible legitimate purpose for which the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name.

**Bad Faith Use:** The Respondent, according to the evidence provided along with the Complaint, is using the disputed domain name to operate a commercial website offering adult entertainment content in direct competition and violation of the trademarks owned by the Complainant. This constitutes bad faith use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. *Fenix International Limited v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Jason Douglas*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0829](#) (finding bad faith use where "the Respondent's Website offers adult entertainment video services in direct competition with the Complainant"); *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org / Kelly Smit, onlyfansleak*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2706](#).

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 addition to the above, the Panel takes note of the following additional circumstances that further support a finding of bad faith:

First, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 8, 2026, demanding cancellation of the disputed domain name and cessation of all infringing use. The Respondent did not reply. A respondent's failure to respond to a pre-complaint cease-and-desist letter is a further indicator of bad faith. *Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. v. John Zuccarini*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0330](#).

Second, the Respondent concealed its identity behind a WHOIS privacy service at the time of filing. The use of a privacy service, combined with failure to participate in these proceedings, further suggests bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6.

Third, the Respondent has defaulted, filing no Response and advancing no explanation for its registration or use of the disputed domain name. The Panel draws the inference, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, that the Respondent could not have offered any credible justification for its conduct.

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 <onlyfansleakvideo.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Munir Suboh/

**Munir Suboh**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026