

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Mayone Renner
Case No. D2026-1400

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Mayone Renner, Belgium, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfanschrisfernandes.com> ("Domain Name") is registered with IONOS SE (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 1, 2026. On April 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name 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 9, 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 in English on April 15, 2026.

On April 9, 2026, the Center informed the parties in German and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Name is German. On April 15, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent 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 Respondent in German and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 10, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on April 26, 2026. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Ana María Pacón 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, Fenix International Limited, is a United Kingdom company and the operator of the ONLYFANS online platform, a subscription-based social media and content-sharing service launched in 2016. The platform enables content creators to monetize digital content through subscriptions, tips, and pay-per-view interactions with users. Over the years, the ONLYFANS platform has grown significantly and has become widely known internationally, attracting millions of creators and users worldwide.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions for the mark ONLYFANS, including:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, covering products and services of classes No. 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 017946559 for ONLYFANS and logo, registered on January 9, 2019, covering products and services of classes No. 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00917912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, covering products and services of classes No. 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;

The Domain Name <onlyfanschrisfernandes.com> was registered on December 10, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Domain Name resolved to a website offering adult-content subscription services and displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo. Currently, the website has been deactivated.

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 Domain Name.

In particular, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its ONLYFANS trademark because it incorporates that trademark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the term "chrisfernandes", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the ONLYFANS trademark, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, and has not made any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

The Complainant also contends that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In this regard, the Complainant submits that its ONLYFANS trademark is well known and predates the registration of the Domain Name. The Complainant further asserts that the Domain Name previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo and offering services related to adult-content subscriptions, thereby creating a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, such conduct demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and intentionally sought to capitalize on the reputation associated with the ONLYFANS trademark.

The Complainant further notes that the Respondent did not reply to its cease-and-desist letter and requests the transfer of the Domain Name.

The Complainant requests transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response. However, on April 26, 2026, the Respondent sent email communications to the Center stating:

"I confirm that I do not wish to contest this proceeding and I consent to the transfer of the domain name to the Complainant."

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Name is German. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Domain Name is composed of English-language terms and that requiring translation would result in unnecessary delay and expense.

The Respondent did not object to the Complainant's request and subsequently communicated with the Center in English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

B. Consent to Transfer

As recorded in the Procedural History section of this Decision, the Respondent sent email communications to the Center on April 26, 2026, clearly stating that he did not wish to contest this proceeding and consenting to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

As reflected in section 4.10 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), where a respondent provides clear and unequivocal consent to the transfer remedy sought by the complainant, panels may order transfer on the basis of such consent without undertaking a substantive analysis of the elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

No Standard Settlement Form was submitted and the proceeding was not suspended for the purpose of implementing a settlement agreement. In the Panel's view, however, the absence of a settlement agreement does not affect the effectiveness of the Respondent's unilateral consent to transfer. See *Instagram, LLC v. Sagarkumar Gopani*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3421](#).

Nevertheless, the Panel considers it appropriate to issue a reasoned decision and to determine whether the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established. In reaching this conclusion, the Panel takes into account that the Complaint contains detailed factual and legal submissions supported by documentary evidence regarding the bad faith use of the Domain Name by the Respondent.

In these circumstances, and consistent with the approach adopted by a number of UDRP panels in similar cases, including *Instagram, LLC v. Sagarkumar Gopani*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3421](#), the Panel finds it appropriate to proceed with an assessment of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

C. 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 Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term "chrisfernandes" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Where a complainant's trademark is recognizable within the Domain Name, the addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, personal, or otherwise, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as it is a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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 Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. To the contrary, the Respondent expressly consented to the transfer of the Domain Name.

The Complainant states that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its ONLYFANS trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. There is also no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Domain Name previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo and offering services related to adult-content subscriptions. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

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

E. 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 Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the term "chrisfernandes" and the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its ONLYFANS trademark when registering the Domain Name.

The record further shows that the Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the Domain Name by several years. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds it implausible that the registration of the Domain Name was coincidental.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Domain Name previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark and logo and offering services related to adult-content subscriptions. Such use supports a finding that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. This constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent initially concealed its identity through a privacy service. While the use of a privacy or proxy registration service is not in itself indicative of bad faith, panels have found that it may support an inference of bad faith when combined with other circumstances of the case. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6. In the present case, the Respondent registered a domain name incorporating the Complainant's distinctive ONLYFANS trademark in its entirety and used it in connection with a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo and offering related services. In similar circumstances involving the ONLYFANS mark, panels have found that the use of a privacy service may reinforce a finding of bad faith. The Panel considers the Respondent's use of a privacy service to be an additional factor supporting a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter sent prior to the filing of the Complaint. While a failure to respond to a cease-and-desist letter is not by itself conclusive of bad faith, panels have considered such conduct as a relevant factor in assessing bad faith under the totality of the circumstances. See, e.g., *Nike, Inc. v. Azumano Travel*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1598](#). In the present case, the Respondent remained silent in the face of the Complainant's allegations and only expressed consent to transfer the Domain Name after commencement of this administrative proceeding. These circumstances further support the Panel's finding of 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 Domain Name <onlyfanschrisfernandes.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ana María Pacón/

Ana María Pacón

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2026