

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Eakapot Klinchompoo
Case No. D2026-2392

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Eakapot Klinchompoo, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfanskub.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, 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 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 5, 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 (Registration Private / DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 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 5, 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 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 29, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 22, 2026. The Center notified the commencement of Panel appointment process on July 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Estela Mariel de Luca as the sole panelist in this matter on July 3, 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 a company organized under the laws of the United States which provides a social media platform under the brand ONLYFANS, allowing users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the Internet, mostly of erotic or pornographic character.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations, including:

- European Union trademark Registration No. 017912377 ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, in international classes 09, 35, 38, 41 and 42;
- European Union trademark Registration No. 017946559 , registered on January 9, 2019, in international classes 09, 35, 38, 41 and 42.;
- United Kingdom trademark Registration No. UK00917946559 , registered on January 9, 2019, in international classes 09, 35, 38, 41 and 42; and

The Complainant's common law rights in the ONLYFANS mark accrued through global use commencing no later than July 4, 2016. The Complainant has held the domain name <onlyfans.com> since January 29, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 23, 2026, and resolves to a website offering adult entertainment services and displaying an "OnlyFanskub" logo that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered Logo.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the ONLYFANS trademark and that the addition of the term "kub" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and must therefore be disregarded under the first element of the Policy.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because: (1) 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 the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner; (2) the Respondent is not commonly known by the ONLYFANS trademark and does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name; (3) the Complainant has achieved global fame and success in a short period of time, making it clear that the Respondent knew of the ONLYFANS trademark when registering the disputed domain name; (4) there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the text of the disputed domain name; (5) the website at the disputed domain name offers adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant's services, such as "providing entertainment services [...] in the nature of a website featuring non-

downloadable videos, photographs, images, audio, and [...] in the field of adult entertainment”; and (6) the website at the disputed domain name contains an “OnlyFanskub” logo that is similar to the Complainant’s registered logo in an attempt to pass itself off as a website of the Complainant and features a logo similar to the Complainant’s ONLYFANS logo.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant has obtained registered rights in the ONLYFANS trademark and long after the Complainant had common law rights in the Marks, which had acquired distinctiveness. In addition, the Complainant contends that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant’s trademark rights when registering the confusingly similar disputed domain name, given that it is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s widely known ONLYFANS trademark, displays a logo similar to the Complainant’s registered logo, and provides products and services in direct competition with the Complainant, including watermarked content pirated from the Complainant’s users, in an attempt to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant’s website.

Finally, The Complainant also contends that the Respondent’s use of privacy service and failure to respond to cease-and-desist communications constitute additional evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions, however sent an email indicating: “Please be advised that I do not wish to submit a formal Response to this complaint. Instead, I hereby formally consent to the remedy requested by the Complainant and agree to transfer the disputed domain name, onlyfanskub.com, to the Complainant.”

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that 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.

Further, it is well established that the gTLD “.one” may be disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The record indicates that the disputed domain name resolves to an active commercial website offering adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant. The Panel finds that such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the record demonstrates that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to divert Internet users to a website designed to mimic the Complainant’s website, including the unauthorized display of a logo similar to the Complainant’s ONLYFANS logo, despite being completely unaffiliated with the Complainant or the Complainant’s services. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Finally, nothing in the record suggests that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in it.

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 Complainant’s rights in the ONLYFANS trademark predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark and directs users to a website displaying a logo confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered mark. Given the distinctiveness and renown of the ONLYFANS trademark, together with the content of the resolving website, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s rights therein at the time of registration.

The mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated party may, in itself, create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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 Panel has found that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to direct users to a website offering adult entertainment services—including content pirated from the Complainant's users—in direct competition with the Complainant. It is evident from the record that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation or passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct constitutes bad faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b) of 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 <onlyfanskub.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Estela Mariel de Luca/

Estela Mariel de Luca

Sole Panelist

Date: July 17, 2026.