ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Fenix International Limited v. Ofclient onlybans, OFClientXOnlyBans
Case No. D2026-2228

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ofclient onlybans, OFClientXOnlyBans, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansclient.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 22, 2026. On May 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 27, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 27, 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 27, 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. On June 26, 2026, the Respondent was granted a five-day period (through July 1, 2026) to indicate whether it wishes to participate to these proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment on July 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on July 10, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant owns and operates the website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com> for a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the web. According to the Complainant, in 2026 the Complainant's website is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant has registered several trademarks consisting of ONLYFANS, including the European Union Trade Mark No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019, covering goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and the International Trademark No. 1507723, registered on November 2, 2019, covering goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

Further, the Complainant also holds figurative trademark registrations such as the United States trademark No. 6918293 for  logo"), registered on December 6, 2022, in class 9.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 31, 2025 and it resolves to a website offering gaming "client" tools for an online game "Dead by Daylight" for a subscription fee and displaying a similar logo to that of the Complainant. It includes a copyright notice, "© 2026 OFClient. All rights reserved."

No information is available on the Respondent apart from the data revealed by the Registrar.

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 consists of the Complainant's exact trademark ONLYFANS with the only difference being the insertion of the descriptive term "client" after the Complainant's trademark, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use its trademarks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a website which contains a logo that is highly similar to the Complainant's registered OF logo in an attempt to pass itself off as a website of the Complainant.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant had attained registered rights in its trademarks and long after the Complainant had common law rights in its trademarks which had acquired distinctiveness. Further, the Complainant contends that the Complainant's trademarks have been recognized in numerous previous UDRP proceedings as "internationally well-known amongst the relevant public" such that the Respondent either knew or ought to have known of the Complainant's trademarks and likely registered the disputed domain name to target such trademarks. This conclusion is further supported according to the Complainant by the fact the disputed domain name contains a stylized OF logo nearly identical to the Complainant's registered OF logo while also using the ONLYFANS trademark in the disputed domain name itself. The Complainant

further contends that bad faith registration has also been found where the disputed domain name includes the complainant's mark and an additional term that "enhances the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant" and thereby "suggests that the website at the disputed domain name is authorized by the complainant" to provide access to the Complainant's services.

As regards the use, the Complainant contends that the Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant's site to a website offering gaming "client" tools under the guise that they are offered by the Complainant. Moreover, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on March 24, 2026, demanding the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name and the Respondent did not respond. The Respondent's failure to respond to this correspondence is further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that "the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence".

No formal response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3.

The Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1, and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 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, "client") 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.

It has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

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.

According to the unrebutted information with the Complaint, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a website offering gaming "client" tools for an online game "Dead by Daylight" with links to "Join Now" and "Member Login", while displaying a logo very similar to the Complainants OF logo. Therefore, it appears most likely that the Respondent intended to target the Complainant's mark and divert traffic to its website, most likely for commercial gain. The Panel does not find this to be a legitimate or bona fide conduct.

The Respondent is named "Ofclient onlybans, OFClientXOnlyBans", as was disclosed by the Registrar, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

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.

The Complainant's registration and use of the relevant trademarks predate the date at which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and its inclusion in the disputed domain name, as well as the display of a logo similar to the Complainant's logo on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, it is more likely than not that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, and intention to target those trademarks. The disputed domain name is used by the Respondent to direct to a website offering gaming "client" tools for an online game "Dead by Daylight". The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4).

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 <onlyfansclient.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/
Mihaela Maravela
Sole Panelist
Date: July 16, 2026