

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Marwane Cherkary
Case No. D2026-2505

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Marwane Cherkary, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlysfanss.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 9, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On June 11, 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 (Redacted For Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 11, 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 12, 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 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the Complainant requested suspension of the proceedings. On July 21, 2026, per the Complainant's request, the Center reinstituted the proceedings

and set the due date for Response as August 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew Sim as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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

The Complainant is a company incorporated in United Kingdom which has owned and operated the domain name <onlyfans.com> continuously since 2013. This domain name hosts the Complainant's homepage, through which the Complainant provides a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content (the "OnlyFans Platform"). In 2026, the OnlyFans Platform has more than 305 million registered users and "www.onlyfans.com" is one of the most visited websites in the world.

In providing its services, the ONLYFANS word and design marks (the "ONLYFANS Marks") have been registered since 2018. The Complainant holds several registered trademarks comprising the word marks of ONLYFANS, ONLYFANS.COM, and OFTV, the lock logo and OF design marks, including:

Jurisdiction	Mark	Registration Number	Registration Date	Class Covered	Status
European Union	ONLYFANS (Stylized)	017946559	January 9, 2019	9, 35, 38, 41 and 42	Registered
	ONLYFANS	017912377	January 9, 2019	9, 35, 38, 41 and 42	Registered
United States	ONLYFANS	5769267	June 4, 2019	35	Registered

The ONLYFANS Marks have been continuously used since at least 2016.

The Disputed Domain Name, <onlyfanss.com>, was registered on February 5, 2026. Based on the Complainant's evidence, the Disputed Domain Name is being used to operate a website that prompts users to enter a "License Key" for the purpose of managing an account on the OnlyFans Platform, a function that can ordinarily be performed only through the Complainant's official OnlyFans Platform.

The Respondent is listed as Marwane Cherkary. Little information is known about the Respondent. Available information provided by the Registrar covers only the registrant's name, postal address, telephone number, and email address.

On March 24, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. According to the case file, the letter remains unanswered.

The Panel notes that the Complainant requested suspension of the proceedings on the grounds of "[i]n light of recent correspondence from Respondent", however, such correspondence was never shared. The Respondent did not send any communications to the Center.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS Marks in which the Complainant has rights. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the ONLYFANS Marks, with a misspelling caused by adding an extra “s” after “only” and an extra “s” after “fans”. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to provide illegal services through a website that requires users to enter a “License Key” in order to access a dashboard connected to a Discord channel linked from the website under the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent’s purpose is to capitalise on the goodwill associated with the ONLYFANS Marks by creating a likelihood of confusion and attracting Internet users seeking access to the OnlyFans Platform and its content, thereby enabling such users to access services and content associated with the OnlyFans Platform in a manner that is unauthorized by the Complainant.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name for the reasons below:

- (a) the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the ONLYFANS Marks, nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant in any form;
- (b) there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name nor is there any legitimate reason for the Respondent to own or use the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (c) the Respondent has no legitimate reason for using the ONLYFANS Marks in connection with the Disputed Domain Name.

Third, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith for the reasons below:

- (a) the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name appear to be an attempt to rely on the Complainant’s and its ONLYFANS Marks’ goodwill to drive traffic to the Respondent’s website resulting from visitors’ confusion;
- (b) the Disputed Domain Name is a typosquatted version of the ONLYFANS Marks;
- (c) Detriment is caused to the Complainant where the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant’s website to a website that presumably offers unauthorized access to the Complainant’s services and users’ content in direct competition with the OnlyFans Platform;
- (d) the Disputed Domain Name is used to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website, wrongfully leveraging the ONLYFANS Marks to mislead the public and drive visitors to the website at the Disputed Domain Name;
- (e) the Respondent has failed to respond to the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter sent on March 24, 2026; and
- (f) the Respondent keeps his/her identity hidden from the public by the use of a Whois privacy wall.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that, in an administrative proceeding, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- (a) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (c) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the below reasons, support for the Complainant can be found due to the satisfaction of the three conditions for the Disputed Domain Name.

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 Marks is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name, with a simple misspelling caused by adding an extra "s" after "only" and an extra "s" after "fans". Panels have consistently found that domain names, which consist of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark, are considered to be confusingly similar thereto, for purposes of the first element, as these domain names contain sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is typically disregarded in the confusingly similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

From the available record, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

Particularly in regard to the three illustrative examples of legitimate interest in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, the Panel finds that:

- (a) the Respondent has not used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, as the Respondent's website is being used with the intent to deceive Internet users into disclosing license keys purportedly for the management of the OnlyFans Platform accounts, thereby falsely implying an association with, or authorization from, the Complainant and the OnlyFans Platform;
- (b) there is no evidence of the Respondent is itself commonly known by or is operating any business or organization with similar name as the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (c) the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name does not fall within the scope of legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in using the ONLYFANS Marks in the Disputed Domain Name.

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.

The Panel finds that the circumstances of registering and using the Disputed Domain Name clearly demonstrate the Respondent's bad faith and have constituted the situation as specified in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy:

- (a) the ONLYFANS Marks have been continuously used since 2016 and registered since 2018, long before the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name which is confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS Marks;
- (b) panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Given the long period of use of the ONLYFANS Marks by the Complainant and the non-affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent, the Panel accepts that the presumption of bad faith is applicable;
- (c) by using the Disputed Domain Name, 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 trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1; and

(d) the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, nor did it deny the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in these proceedings.

Inference of bad faith is also drawn in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for the Respondent's failure to file a response as required in paragraph 5(a) of the Rules in the absence of exceptional circumstances.

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 <onlysfanss.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew Sim/

Andrew Sim

Sole Panelist

Date: August 24, 2026