

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Maria L. Santos, Loogle Inc.
Case No. D2026-1427

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Maria L. Santos, Loogle Inc., Philippines.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <onlyfansleak.art>, <onlyfansleak.click>, <onlyfansleak.cyou>, <onlyfansleak.icu>, <onlyfansleak.lat>, <onlyfansleak.lol>, <onlyfansleak.sbs> and <onlyfansleak.top> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 2, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (unknown) 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 9, 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 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Indrek Eelmets as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 <onlyfans.com> and has used its domain name for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content.

The Complainant is in particular the owner of the following trademark registrations:

Jurisdictions	Trademarks	Registration Numbers	Registration Date
European Union	ONLYFANS	017912377	January 9, 2019
United States	ONLYFANS	5769267	June 4, 2019
International	ONLYFANS	1507723	November 2, 2019

The Complainant registered the domain name <onlyfans.com> on January 29, 2013, and has legal rights in the ONLYFANS mark throughout the world that commenced by, at latest, July 4, 2016. The Complainant's website is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

The disputed domain names were registered on December 5, 2025. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain names previously redirected to Telegram channels offering adult entertainment services. The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Registrar on January 7, 2026, following which the disputed domain names were redirected to error pages. As of the date of this Decision, this status remains in place for <onlyfansleak.art>, <onlyfansleak.click>, and <onlyfansleak.icu>. The remaining disputed domain names, namely <onlyfansleak.lat>, <onlyfansleak.lol>, <onlyfansleak.sbs>, and <onlyfansleak.top>, resolve to webpages displaying browser "dangerous site" warning messages as of the date of this Decision.

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 the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since the disputed domain names contain the mark in its entirety, with the only difference being the insertion of the descriptive term "leak" after the Complainant's mark.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since (1) the Respondent has no relationship with or permission from the Complainant to use its trademark, (2) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain names.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith since (1) the Respondent registered the disputed domain names long after the Complainant registered its respective trademark, (2) the Complainant's mark has become well-known and the Respondent registered the disputed domain names to target the Complainant's mark, (3) the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, (4) the disputed domain names previously redirected to a commercial website that offers adult entertainment content in direct competition with the Complainant's services.

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 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, "leak", 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 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.

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 must have been aware of the trademark when she registered the disputed domain names given the trademark was registered and has become well-known internationally prior to registration of the disputed domain names.

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.

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 distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the Respondent's failure to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 names <onlyfansleak.art>, <onlyfansleak.click>, <onlyfansleak.cyou>, <onlyfansleak.icu>, <onlyfansleak.lat>, <onlyfansleak.lol>, <onlyfansleak.sbs>, and <onlyfansleak.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Indrek Eelmets/

Indrek Eelmets

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026