

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. xgerry 1
Case No. D2026-2185

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is xgerry 1, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sinfuldeeds-onlyfans.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 20, 2026. On May 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 22, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD, c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 23, 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 May 24, 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 May 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on June 28, 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 is Fenix International Limited, a company that owns and operates the online platform located at the domain name <onlyfans.com>, through which it provides a social media service enabling users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content. The Complainant registered the <onlyfans.com> domain name on January 29, 2013, and has made extensive use of the ONLYFANS mark in connection with its services since at least July 4, 2016. According to the evidence on record, by 2026 the Complainant's platform had more than 305 million registered users, and ONLYFANS was considered as a well-known mark by previous UDRP panels.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations incorporating the ONLYFANS mark, including registrations before the European Union Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO"), the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office ("UKIPO"), and the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"), as well as International Registrations under the Madrid Protocol. For the purposes of this proceeding, the Panel notes in particular the following registrations: EUIPO; (i) Reg. No. 017946559, registered on January 9, 2019, for classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; (ii) Reg. No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019, for classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; UKIPO; (i) Reg. No. UK00917912377, registered on January 9, 2019, for classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; (ii) Reg. No. UK00917946559, registered on January 9, 2019, for classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; USPTO; (i) Reg. No. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019, for class 35; (ii) Reg. No. 6253475, registered on January 26, 2021, for classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The Complainant's earliest registered trademark rights date back to January 9, 2019.

In addition to its registered rights, the Complainant asserts unregistered common law rights in the ONLYFANS mark which, according to a previous UDRP panel, acquired distinctiveness through use by July 4, 2016. See *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Admin, Beacons AI Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0113](#). The Complainant's rights in the ONLYFANS marks have additionally been recognized in numerous prior UDRP decisions resulting in the transfer or cancellation of the relevant disputed domain names. See, e.g., *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on December 20, 2025. According to the evidence on record, the disputed domain name resolved to a website, in the Indonesian language, offering online lottery ("togel") and slot gambling services under the name "Kupontoto". Its landing page prominently featured the image of a woman. On March 24, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter through the Registrar demanding that the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name. According to the record, the Respondent did not reply.

The Respondent did not submit a Response in the present proceeding either.

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 mark, on which it claims rights based on multiple registrations, as well as common law rights predating the

disputed domain name by nearly a decade. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name reproduces the ONLYFANS mark in its entirety, and that the addition of the descriptive phrase “sinful deeds”, the use of a hyphen, and the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, nor has it been ever authorized to use the ONLYFANS mark. In addition, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and further asserts that the Respondent cannot claim fair use, since the disputed domain name incorporates the mark together with an additional phrase that creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant additionally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, given the well-known character of the ONLYFANS mark, which the Respondent knew or should have known at the time of registration, and the use of the disputed domain name to divert Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant further relies on the Respondent’s failure to respond to its cease-and-desist letter and the Respondent’s use of a privacy service to conceal its identity as additional indicia of bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the Panel order the 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

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- iii. the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 record shows that the Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for the ONLYFANS mark before, inter alia, the USPTO, EUIPO, and UKIPO, as set out in the Factual Background above.

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 the phrase “sinful deeds” 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. The Panel further notes that the use of a hyphen to separate the components of the disputed domain name does not alter this conclusion.

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 Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the ONLYFANS mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and that no relationship exists between the Parties. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights corresponding to it. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

As noted above, the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering online gambling services under the name “Kupontoto”, which bears no apparent connection to the terms comprising the disputed domain name and provides no basis for any rights or legitimate interests in it. A disputed domain name comprising a complainant’s trademark together with additional terms cannot constitute fair use where doing so effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s distinctive and well-known ONLYFANS mark in its entirety, merely adding the phrase “sinful deeds”, which carries a risk of implied affiliation by suggesting to Internet users that the disputed domain name, and the services offered under it, originate from or are endorsed by the Complainant. The Panel further notes that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to offer commercial gambling services unrelated to the Complainant does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii).

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.

The record shows that the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark has been registered since January 9, 2019, and that the Complainant has used the mark in commerce since at least 2016, in each case predating the registration of the disputed domain name on December 20, 2025. Given the well-known character of the ONLYFANS mark, as previously found by other UDRP panels, this Panel considers that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and of its trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

As noted in the Factual Background, the disputed domain name resolved to a commercial website offering online gambling services. By fully incorporating the Complainant's well-known mark within the disputed domain name, the Respondent was, in the Panel's view, seeking to attract Internet users to its commercial website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website. The fact that the services ultimately offered are unrelated to those of the Complainant does not alter this assessment; the likelihood of confusion arises from the composition of the disputed domain name itself, which trades on the recognition of the Complainant's mark to divert Internet users for the Respondent's own commercial gain. Such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent did not reply to the cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant on March 24, 2026 and failed to submit a reply in this proceeding either. In addition, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name behind a Whois privacy shield. The Panel finds that the Respondent's silence in the face of the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, combined with its use of a privacy service and its default in this proceeding, supports an inference 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 disputed domain name <sinfuldeeds-onlyfans.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: July 13, 2026