

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. mehmet cicek
Case No. D2026-3326

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is mehmet cicek, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <peekonlyfans.pics> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 28, 2026. On July 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 29, 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 Purposes) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 4, 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 August 4, 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 August 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Juan Lapenne as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 owns and operates a website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com> in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to adult audiovisual content on the World Wide Web. The Complainant submits that it has been using this domain name since at least 2016 and that currently it has more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

European Union trademark registration No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42;

United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00917912377 for ONLYFANS, registered on January 9, 2019, in Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and

United States trademark registration No. 5769267 for ONLYFANS, registered on June 4, 2019, in Class 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 11, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to an active website that offers adult entertainment services in direct competition with the Complainant's services. Such a website advertises content as "leaked" from the Complainant.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on April 19, 2026. The Respondent did not respond.

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 trademark ONLYFANS. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's exact trademark with the only addition of the descriptive term "peek", which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that the ONLYFANS trademark has acquired distinctiveness and is an internationally well-known trademark among the relevant public.

The Complainant contends that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".pics" is irrelevant to determine the confusing similarity between the trademark and the disputed domain name.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has never been licensed, authorized or permitted by the Complainant to use the trademark ONLYFANS.

The Complainant highlights that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that it lacks any trademark for the disputed domain name.

In addition to the above, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain name in direct competition to the Complainant's services, does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant submits that given the distinctiveness and well-known character of the ONLYFANS trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. Hence, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to target Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to operate a website that is in direct competition with the Complainant's services, is indeed an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15 (a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the respondent 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

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights over the trademark ONLYFANS, based on the trademark registrations cited under section 4 above.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark, as it entirely incorporates the ONLYFANS trademark with the mere addition of the term "peek" and the gTLD ".pics". Indeed, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of the term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The applicable gTLD (here ".pics") in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has established rights according to paragraph 4 (a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

In the instant case, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to incorporate its ONLYFANS trademark in the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent a licensee of the Complainant.

From the evidence on record, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark. Moreover, the website offers to Internet users ONLYFANS “leaked” content using the following language: “Close Peek Leaked Onlyfans Contents”. The website offers Internet users several videos and pictures described as “Onlyfans Leaked” “videos” and “pics”. This indicates the Respondent's intention to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation for commercial gain.

In the absence of any authorization from the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name was registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith.

As to registration, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant registered its ONLYFANS trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known (among the relevant public) ONLYFANS trademark with the mere addition of the term “peek”. Besides, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website offering services in direct competition with the Complainant. Due to this, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known that the registration of the domain name would be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) section 3.2.2

Moreover, the Respondent's website features "Leaked Onlyfans Contents" ("Videos" and "Pics"), without authorization from either the Complainant or the Complainant's users. Such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1 section 3.1.4.

The following facts on record confirm the Respondent's bad faith: the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter; the Respondent's failure to participate in the present proceeding; and the registration of the disputed domain name under a privacy shield.

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 <peekonlyfans.pics> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Juan Lapenne/

Juan Lapenne

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2026