

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Linda Crute
Case No. D2026-1361

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Linda Crute, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfans-vip.com> 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 30, 2026. On March 31, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 1, 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 April 1, 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 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Michelle Brownlee as the sole panelist in this matter on April 29, 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 a web site located at the domain name <onlyfans.com> which is a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the Internet. The Complainant has been providing its services since at least as early as July 4, 2016.

The Complainant owns numerous registrations in jurisdictions throughout the world for the ONLYFANS trademark, including:

European Union Registration Number 17912377, registered on January 9, 2019 for goods in International Class 9 and services in International Classes 35, 38, 41 and 42;

United States Registration Number 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019 for services in International Class 35; and

United States Registration Number 6253455, registered on January 26, 2021 for goods in International Class 9 and services in International Classes 35, 38, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 26, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a web site that has no content on the home page, but there are other web pages that use URLs that incorporate the disputed domain name that show what appears to be a pop-up window that is displayed over a blurred background that resembles the Complainant's web site. The pop-up window requests that the user log in to view the content on the site and asks for the user's email and password. The pop-up window contains a link that says "Sign up for OnlyFans."

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 trademark, the Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant argues that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host web pages that appear to be designed to entice users to enter their login information by creating confusion with the Complainant's services is evidence of the Respondent's bad faith registration and use. The Complainant also argues that the Respondent's use of a privacy service and failure to respond to a cease and desist letter sent by the Complainant are further evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

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.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "vip", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off as the Complainant for the likely purpose of phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 displayed what appeared to be a pop-up window over a blurred background that resembled the Complainant's web site. The pop-up window further referred

to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark. Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that bad faith exists under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy because the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off as the Complainant's web site for the likely purpose of phishing constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <onlyfans-vip.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Michelle Brownlee/

Michelle Brownlee

Sole Panelist

Date: May 7, 2026