

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Kieran Holmes
Case No. D2026-2188

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Kieran Holmes, Afghanistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <only-fans-online-gaming.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 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same date, 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 22, 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on June 22, 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 worldwide 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 27, 2025. According to the evidence on record, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website offering a downloadable gaming application described as an online casino, which displayed a logo closely resembling the Complainant's registered logo including a blue lock design. It identified "Only Fans Canada inc." as the application's developer. On March 24, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the privacy email address associated with the Respondent demanding that the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name. According to the record, the Respondent failed to reply. As of the date of this Decision, attempts to access the disputed domain name return a server connection error, indicating that the website is no longer accessible to the public.

The Respondent is identified in the Registrar-disclosed Whois record as Kieran Holmes, with a listed address in the United Kingdom, and a United Kingdom telephone number. The record nonetheless lists the Respondent's country as Afghanistan.

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

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 phrase "online gaming", the use of hyphens, 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 this connection, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is unable to claim fair use given that the website formerly hosted at the disputed domain name displayed a logo identical to the Complainant's registered lock logo and identified the offered gaming application as being provided by "Only Fans Canada inc.", thus creating 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, the Respondent's impersonation of the Complainant through unauthorized use of its logo and branding, and the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter while concealing its identity behind a privacy shield.

The Complainant requests the Panel to 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.

Disregarding the gTLD “.com”, the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant’s ONLYFANS mark solely by the addition of hyphens and the descriptive phrases “online” and “gaming”.

Although the addition of the phrases “online” and “gaming” and the use of hyphens may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements 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 hyphens 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.

The record does not indicate any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to register or use any domain name incorporating the ONLYFANS mark. Further, according to an independent, non-official search conducted by the Panel, the Respondent (identified with the country Afghanistan) appears as registrant or respondent in multiple other domain name dispute proceedings, none of which were decided in the Respondent’s favor, which indicates the Respondent’s engagement in a pattern of registering domain names corresponding to marks held by third parties. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2.

The record further shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website offering a downloadable gaming application described as an online casino, which displayed a logo identical to the Complainant's registered logo containing a lock design, replicated the Complainant's browser tab icon and color scheme, and identified "Only Fans Canada inc." as the application's developer, without disclosing any true identity or lack of affiliation with the Complainant. A disputed domain name incorporating 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 addition of the phrase "online gaming" to the Complainant's mark, combined with the Respondent's replication of the Complainant's logo, branding, and its adoption of a developer name closely resembling the Complainant's own, creates a clear risk of implied affiliation and 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).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here passing off the Respondent's website and application as being affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant through the unauthorized reproduction of the Complainant's logo, branding, and a developer name using the Complainant's mark, 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.

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 27, 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. See *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, supra.

Taken together, the notoriety of the Complainant's mark and the Respondent's deliberate replication of multiple elements associated with the Complainant's brand (lock logo, browser tab icon and color scheme plus identification of an entity using the Complainant's mark, "Only Fans Canada", as the source of the offered application) leave no room for any credible inference other than that the disputed domain name was registered in full knowledge of the Complainant's rights and with the intention of capitalizing on the reputation of its well-known mark.

The website formerly hosted at the disputed domain name offered a downloadable gaming application promoted as an online casino and presented in a manner clearly designed to create the false impression that it was operated, endorsed, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant. Such use was plainly intended to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark and to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of both the website and the application offered through it. Such behavior falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here passing off the Respondent's website and application as being affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant through the unauthorized reproduction of the Complainant's logo, branding, and a developer name using the Complainant's mark, 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 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 and also appears to have provided inconsistent contact information when registering the disputed domain name (listed address in the United Kingdom but Afghanistan as the country). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6. 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 further reiterates that the Respondent appears to have been the registrant or respondent in several other domain name dispute proceedings, all of which resulted in decisions against it. The Panel also observes that the Respondent failed to submit a response in any of those proceedings. Although not conclusive on its own, this apparent pattern of adverse findings reinforces the inference of bad-faith conduct and is taken into account as an additional supporting circumstance in the present case.

Regarding the current non-use of the disputed domain name which does not resolve to an active website, 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 well-known character of the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark, the Respondent's documented impersonation of the Complainant through the disputed domain name prior to the filing of this Complaint, the absence of any Response or credible explanation for the registration, and the Respondent's apparent pattern of similar conduct in other proceedings, and finds that the current inaccessibility of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves 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 name <only-fans-online-gaming.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: July 6, 2026