

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Only Fans MOD APK, Only Fans MOD APK
Case No. D2026-2666

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Only Fans MOD APK, Only Fans MOD APK, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 18, 2026. On June 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On June 19, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 22, 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 22, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuzo Wada as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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, Fenix International Ltd, owns and operates the website located at the domain <onlyfans.com>. The Complainant submits that it has been using this domain since at least 2016 in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web. In 2026, the Complainant's website had more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations consisting of, or containing, the term "onlyfans" in various jurisdictions. The Complainant's portfolio of ONLYFANS trademark registrations includes, inter alia, the following trademark registrations:

- European Union trademark No. 017912377 ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;
- United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office trademark No. UK00917912377 ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and
- United States service mark No. 5769267 ONLYFANS, registered on June 4, 2019, in Class 35, claiming first use in commerce on July 4, 2016.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on January 21, 2026.

At the time the Complaint was filed, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an active website. The website offers an application that enables users to access the Complainant's OnlyFans platform and paywalled content free of charge in an unauthorized manner. It includes the following text: "Watch Premium Photos, Videos, Reels and content for free, which is only accessible by paid subscribers."

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks any rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain a decision that a domain name should be either cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the 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 Selected 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 Complainant has rights in the registered mark ONLYFANS. The Panel further finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to this mark, since the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's trademark.

Although the addition of other terms to the Disputed Domain Name, here "mod" and "apk" (allegedly descriptive terms), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the ONLYFANS Marks 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

Under the second element of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent may establish a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name by demonstrating any of the following non-exhaustive circumstances listed in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy:

- (a) that the Respondent has used, or made preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to any notice of the dispute; or
- (b) that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (c) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark registrations predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademarks. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant. In addition, the Complainant has not

licensed or otherwise consented to the Respondent's use of the trademarks in connection with the Disputed Domain Name.

From the evidence in the case record, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark. It also contains ONLYFANS and OF logos, that are identical to the Complainant's registered logo trademarks. The website offers services through an application that enables users to access the Complainant's OnlyFans platform and paywalled content free of charge in an unauthorized manner. It includes the following text: "Watch Premium Photos, Videos, Reels and content for free, which is only accessible by paid subscribers." The use of the Disputed Domain Name for illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. WIPO Overviews 3.1, section 2.13.1.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name cannot be regarded as use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In addition, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers to the Respondent's website.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate otherwise.

Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not participated in the dispute and has not submitted any evidence to demonstrate that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name or that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not come forward with any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Thus, the Panel concludes that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be evidence of the registration and use in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or has acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or

(ii) the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding Disputed Domain Name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith since the Respondent's actions fall within the scope of the example of such circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered after the Complainant first acquired rights in the ONLYFANS trademark.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark is distinctive and well known (*Fenix International Limited v. Aniket salunkhe, Anny*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3614](#)). The incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by a registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith (*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#); and *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#)).

Without the authorization from the Complainant, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name incorporating the Complainant's well-known mark and resolved it to a website displaying the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark, the Complainant's ONLYFANS and OF logos, and purporting to offer services through an application that enables users to access Complainant's OnlyFans platform and paywalled content free of charge in an unauthorized manner. The use of the Disputed Domain Name for such activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent, and such behavior is considered evidence of bad faith. WIPO Overviews 3.1, section 3.1.4.

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 <onlyfansmodapk.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuzo Wada/

Yuzo Wada

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2026