

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Zhichao Yang
Case No. D2026-2418

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Zhichao Yang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <onlyfansxnude.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 3, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On June 7, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 9, 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 amended Complaint on June 9, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 14, 2026.

The Center appointed José de Pierola as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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 operates a social media platform available at the domain name <onlyfans.com>, which allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content. The Complainant registered the <onlyfans.com> domain name on January 29, 2013, and in 2026 the platform reports more than 305 million registered users worldwide.

The Complainant owns registered trademark rights in ONLYFANS and related marks (collectively, the “Marks”) in multiple jurisdictions, including:

- (i) European Union Trade Mark Registration Nos. 017912377 and 017946559 (word and design marks), which also generated corresponding national United Kingdom registrations, UK00917912377 and UK00917946559, following the United Kingdom’s exit from the European Union, registered in 2019;
- (ii) United States Patent and Trademark Office Registration No. 5769267, registered in 2019, for the word mark ONLYFANS, and Registration No. 6253455 for the word mark ONLYFANS, registered in 2021
- (iii) International Registration Nos. 1507723 and 1509110, registered in 2019 under the Madrid Protocol.

Independently of its registered rights, the Complainant asserts unregistered trademark rights in ONLYFANS that it contends acquired distinctiveness by no later than July 4, 2016 — a date previously recognized by a WIPO panel in *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Admin, Beacons AI Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0113](#). In *Fenix International Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc., WhoisGuard Protected / Marry Mae Cerna*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0327](#), a prior panel found the ONLYFANS mark to be internationally well known amongst the relevant public. The Complainant states that its rights in the Marks have been recognized in more than 150 prior UDRP decisions ordering the transfer or cancellation of infringing domain names.

The Disputed Domain Name <onlyfansxnude.com> was registered on January 18, 2026. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name has been used to redirect Internet users to a website offering adult entertainment content, in direct competition with the services the Complainant offers under the Marks.

On March 10, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent demanding that the Respondent cease use of, and cancel, the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent did not reply.

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.

On the first element, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the ONLYFANS mark in its entirety, and that the addition of the descriptive term “xnude”, together with the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

On the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has never been authorized to use the Marks, is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, and has used the Disputed Domain Name to redirect Internet users to a website offering services in direct competition with the Complainant, which the Complainant argues cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests. The Complainant further contends that the addition of the term “xnude” to its mark creates a risk of implied affiliation that is incompatible with any claim of fair use.

On the third element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, in light of: the fame of the Marks and the Respondent’s presumed knowledge of them at the time of registration; the use of the Disputed Domain Name to redirect to a directly competing commercial website; the Respondent’s failure to respond to the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter; the Respondent’s use of a privacy shield; and the Respondent’s demonstrated pattern of registering domain names that target third-party trademarks, including the Complainant’s Marks specifically in e.g. two other UDRP proceedings.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish each of the following three elements to obtain a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name: (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 entirety of the ONLYFANS 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 term “xnude” may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of this 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.

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 has been used to redirect to a website offering adult entertainment services in direct competition with those offered by the Complainant. Use of a domain name to redirect to a website offering goods or services that compete with the trademark owner does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

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 Panel finds that the Respondent’s conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant’s well-known ONLYFANS mark in its entirety and has been used to redirect Internet users to a website offering directly competing adult entertainment content, indicating an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to that website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel further finds bad faith registration under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy in light of the Respondent’s demonstrated pattern of registering domain names incorporating third-party trademarks. This pattern is evidenced not only by proceedings brought by unrelated trademark owners against the Respondent — *Tyson Foods, Inc. v. 杨智超 (Zhichao Yang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-4377](#), *DispatchHealth Management, LLC v. Zhichao Yang*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4507](#), and *CC Network Limited v. Zhichao Yang, Zhichao Yang*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4013](#) — but, more pointedly, by two prior UDRP proceedings, *Fenix International Limited v. Zhichao*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0806](#) and *Fenix International Limited c/o Walters Law Group v. Zhichao Yang*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0849](#), in which the Respondent was found to have registered a total of ten domain names each incorporating variations or misspellings of the Complainant’s own ONLYFANS mark, all of which were ordered transferred to the Complainant. Where the record shows that a respondent is a serial cybersquatter, and in particular where that respondent has previously targeted the same complainant’s mark, a panel may readily infer, absent any explanation from the respondent, that the respondent has again targeted that mark in registering the disputed domain name.

Given the fame and long-standing use of the ONLYFANS mark, which significantly predates the January 18, 2026 registration of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, and the Respondent's default in this proceeding further support 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 <onlyfansxnude.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/José de Pierola/

José de Pierola

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026