

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Fenix International Limited v. ali alkhamis  
Case No. D2026-2370

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is ali alkhamis, Saudi Arabia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <onlyfans1.help> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 2, 2026. On June 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 2, 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 (Privacy User #99d63918, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 June 3, 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 June 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on July 2, 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 a social media platform at the domain name <onlyfans.com> – registered on January 29, 2013 – that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for ONLYFANS, including the following, as per trademark registration certificates submitted as annex C to the Complaint:

- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS (word mark), filed on June 5, 2018, and registered on January 9, 2019, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 017946559 for ONLYFANS (figurative mark), filed on August 22, 2018, and registered on January 9, 2019, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 5769267 for ONLYFANS (word mark), filed on October 29, 2018, and registered on June 4, 2019, claiming first use as of July 4, 2016, in international class 35; and
- United States trademark registration No. 6253455 for ONLYFANS (word mark), filed on November 2, 2019, and registered on January 26, 2021, in international classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 7, 2026, and resolves to a website (“Website”) which appears to be structured like a forum site as it displays posts on various topics; however, the posts are dated April 2025 and earlier and no comments have been published in relation to any of them. The latest post, which is the one immediately visible when accessing the Website, displays the image of a girl with the heading “Date me” and links to an adult content website.

#### **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 the trademark ONLYFANS in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the numeral “1” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.help”, which does not sufficiently distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s trademark.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is in no way connected or affiliated with the Complainant nor has it ever received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is also not commonly known by the disputed domain name and does not hold any trademarks for the terms encompassed in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as the Respondent has been pointing the disputed domain name to a website hosting adult content in direct competition with the Complainant’s services.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith registration, the Complainant indicates that, considering: i) the disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant attained registered rights in its ONLYFANS trademark and long after the Complainant accrued common law rights in the trademark which had acquired distinctiveness; ii) the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark; and iii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect users to a website providing services in direct competition with the Complainant, the Respondent was aware of, and intended to target the Complainant and its trademark through the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of its Website.

The Complainant also submits that the Respondent's failure to reply to a cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant to the Respondent on March 24, 2026, and its use of a Whois privacy service to hide its identity further demonstrate the Respondent's bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall 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." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of national and regional trademark registrations for ONLYFANS. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ONLYFANS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the mere addition of the numeral "1" and the gTLD ".help", which can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s trademarks. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

As highlighted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website which is structured like a forum site, but displays posts dated before the registration of the disputed domain name – which could thus be taken from other sources –, and no comments from other users. Moreover, the latest post, published at the top of the website and dated April 22, 2025, displays the wording “Date me” and links which lead users to an adult content website. In view of such contents, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name does not appear to have been genuinely used in connection with a legitimate forum site. The Panel also notes that, considering the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark and the contents of the website, it appears that the disputed domain name has been used by the Respondent to divert users to its own Website and the websites linked thereto, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

As to the bad faith at the time of the registration, the Panel notes that, in light of the prior registration and use of the Complainant’s trademark ONLYFANS online via the Complainant’s website “www.onlyfans.com” and the popularity reached by the Complainant’s website in the recent years, the Respondent was or could have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark ONLYFANS and knew or should have known that its registration would be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, considering the one-character difference between the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name and the Respondent's redirection of the disputed domain name to a website promoting, via the links published therein, adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent was indeed actually aware of the Complainant and registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant and its trademark.

In view of the use of the disputed domain name in connection with the Website – promoting adult content –, the Panel also finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its Website, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website and the websites linked thereto, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and to the Complaint further supports the conclusion that the Respondent acted in bad faith.

Therefore, 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 <onlyfans1.help> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Luca Barbero/*

**Luca Barbero**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 16, 2026