

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Avtar Singh
Case No. D2026-2464

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Avtar Singh, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <onlyfansifsa1.link> and <onlyfansifsa2.link> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 8, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same date.

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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Estela Mariel de Luca as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 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, including of erotic or pornographic character.

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

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

According to the Complaint, 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 names <onlyfansifsa1.link> and <onlyfansifsa2.link> were registered on January 19 and 27, 2026, respectively, and both redirect to the website at the domain name <turkifsa.blog>, which offered competing adult entertainment services.

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 names.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names wholly incorporate the ONLYFANS trademark and that the addition of the terms "ifsa" plus "1" or "2" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. The Complainant further contends that the inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".link" 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 names 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 names 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 names; (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 names; (4) there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the text of the disputed domain names; (5) the website the disputed domain names redirect to 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 video, photographs, images, audio, and ... in the field of adult entertainment".

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith. Specifically, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names long after the Complainant had obtained registered rights in the ONLYFANS trademark and long after the Complainant had acquired common law rights in the marks. In addition, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's trademark rights when registering the confusingly similar disputed domain names, as demonstrated by the incorporation of the widely known ONLYFANS mark alongside the Turkish term for "leak" ("ifsa") within the disputed domain names. Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the inclusion of this specific term enhances the likelihood of confusion, falsely suggesting that the underlying website is authorized by the Complainant to provide access to its services.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent provides products and services in direct competition with the Complainant.

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.

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) that the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a Response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

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 names. 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 the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 generic Top-Level Domain “.link” may be disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. See section 1.11 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The record indicates that the disputed domain names redirect to an active 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 names to redirect Internet users to a third-party website offering adult entertainment content. Such use takes advantage of the association created by the disputed domain names with the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark and diverts Internet users to an unaffiliated website without the Complainant’s authorization. Panels have recognized that a respondent’s use of a complainant’s mark to redirect users to a competing website does not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests, particularly where such use seeks to capitalize on the reputation of the complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3.

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

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 names. The Panel notes that the disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark and redirect Internet users to a competing website offering adult entertainment content in the same field of activity as the Complainant. Given the renown of the ONLYFANS trademark, together with the nature of the content available on the resolving website, the Panel finds that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's rights in the mark at the time of registration.

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

Furthermore, the record demonstrates that the Respondent has intentionally used the disputed domain names to divert Internet users to an unaffiliated website offering adult entertainment content without the Complainant's authorization. Such use takes advantage of the likelihood of confusion created by the incorporation of the ONLYFANS trademark in the disputed domain names in order to attract Internet users to the competing website and constitutes bad faith use under paragraphs 4(b)(iii) and (iv) 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 names <onlyfansifsa1.link> and <onlyfansifsa2.link> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Estela Mariel de Luca/

Estela Mariel de Luca

Sole Panelist

Date: July 20, 2026