

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Guoming Cai
Case No. D2026-3599

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Guoming Cai, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfansfree.live> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 12, 2026. On August 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 14, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 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 14, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Eric Macramalla as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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 the website located at “www.onlyfans.com”, and has used this domain name for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to online audiovisual content.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for trademarks that are comprised of, or contain, ONLYFANS (the “ONLYFANS Trademarks”). Examples of these trademark registrations are set out below:

(a) ONLYFANS, United States Trademark Registration No. 5769267 filed for use in association with Class 35, and registered since June 4, 2019;

(b) ONLYFANS, United States Trademark Registration No. 6253455 filed for use in association with Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42, and registered since January 26, 2021;

(c) ONLYFANS, European Union Trademark Registration No. 17912377 filed for use in association with Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42, and registered since January 9, 2019; and

(d) ONLYFANS, International Trademark Registration No. 1507723 filed for use in association with Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42, and registered since November 2, 2019.

The Complainant has made continuous use of the ONLYFANS Trademarks since at least as early as July 2016.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 10, 2026. The disputed domain name was previously made to resolve to a website featuring adult content under ONLYFANSFREE. The disputed domain name is currently inactive.

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.

The Complainant has alleged that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS Trademarks in which it has rights. The Respondent has incorporated the whole of the ONLYFANS trademark in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as contemplated by paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the ONLYFANS Trademarks and is not otherwise connected to the Respondent. The Respondent's activities do not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is not making any fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith as per paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed a complainant must establish the following:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

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 established rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Complainant has established rights in the ONLYFANS Trademarks in light of its numerous trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name incorporates the whole of the ONLYFANS trademark, which is plainly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of the word "free" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 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 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 provide 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, on a balance of probabilities, that 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 Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted, the Respondent to use the ONLYFANS Trademarks in any manner, including as part of a domain name. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is also no basis to conclude 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. There is also no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The disputed domain name previously resolved to a commercial website featuring adult content under ONLYFANSFREE. The Respondent's activities were calculated to mislead and confuse Internet users as to source or sponsorship from the Complainant.

The notoriety of the Complainant's longstanding trademark rights and the disputed domain name incorporating the whole of the ONLYFANS trademark, and its use to resolve to a website offering competing services, support a finding that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests 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.

While paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, other circumstances may also be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Respondent reproduced in the disputed domain name the Complainant's trademark with a view to mislead potential consumers as to source or sponsorship. The Respondent previously used the disputed domain name in association with a commercial website under ONLYFANSFREE. The Panel finds that the Respondent has, for financial gain, registered and used the disputed domain name to create the overall impression that it was authorized by the Complainant, or otherwise connected to it. The Respondent's conduct bears the hallmarks of passing off. Panels have held that passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that 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 its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy). This constitutes evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The disputed domain name is no longer in active use. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

The disputed domain name, which was registered almost a decade after the Complainant commenced using the ONLYFANS trademark, is confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS Trademarks and, if use were to resume, it would likely cause confusion among Internet users as to the source, affiliation, or sponsorship. Having considered the reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainant's ONLYFANS Trademarks, the Panel finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

Therefore, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 name <onlyfansfree.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Eric Macramalla/

Eric Macramalla

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2026