ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Fenix International Limited v. Dmitry Berg
Case No. D2026-4016

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Dmitry Berg, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfans-girls.org> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 8, 2026. On September 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 9, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 10, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to amend the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 10, 2026, adding the registrant disclosed by the Registrar as the Respondent.

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 September 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 9, 2026. The Center's email notification to the postmaster address of the disputed domain name could not be delivered. The

Notification of Complaint was, however, also sent to the email address disclosed by the Registrar, for which no delivery failure was reported, notice was forwarded through the Registrar's WHOIS email forwarding form, and Written Notice was dispatched by courier to the postal address disclosed by the Registrar.

The Center appointed Nathalie Dreyfus as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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 Limited, operates the online platform at "www.onlyfans.com", through which users may publish and subscribe to audiovisual and other content, including adult entertainment content. According to the Complaint, the Complainant has used the ONLYFANS trademark since at least 2016, and its <onlyfans.com> domain name was registered on January 29, 2013.

The Complainant owns registrations for the ONLYFANS word mark in several jurisdictions (the "ONLYFANS trademark"), including:

- European Union trademark Registration No. 017912377 for ONLYFANS, filed on June 5, 2018 and registered on January 9, 2019;
- United Kingdom trademark Registration No. UK00917912377 for ONLYFANS, filed on June 5, 2018 and registered on January 9, 2019; and
- United States trademark Registration No. 5769267 for ONLYFANS, registered on June 4, 2019.

The Complainant also relies on further registrations for ONLYFANS and ONLYFANS.COM, including figurative marks and International Registrations under the Madrid System. The ONLYFANS trademark is used in connection with the Complainant's online content platform and related services.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 28, 2026. The disputed domain name combines the ONLYFANS trademark, a hyphen, the term "girls", and the generic Top-Level Domain ".org".

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint (Annex D to the Complaint), the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying adult entertainment material, including content that the Complainant alleges was copied from its users' pages and bears their watermarks. The screenshots of the website taken on September 7, 2026 and included in the case file show a Russian-language website branded presenting galleries of intimate photographs labelled with the names of individuals, whose footer describes the website, in translation, as a large archive of leaked intimate photographs of OnlyFans and Busty models available entirely free of charge. The Respondent is an individual located in the Russian Federation, identified by the Registrar as Dmitry Berg. The Complainant states that the Respondent has no affiliation with it and is not authorized to use its trademarks. According to the Complainant, it sent a cease-and-desist letter on June 26, 2026, requesting cessation of use and cancellation of the disputed domain name, to which no reply was received.

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 confusingly similar to the ONLYFANS trademark because it reproduces the trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the descriptive term "girls" does not prevent confusion. It submits that the ".org" generic Top-Level Domain is irrelevant to the first-element assessment. The Complainant refers in particular to *Fenix International Limited v. Andre Miuts*, WIPO Case No. D2023-2556, concerning <onlyfansgirls.online>.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted to use the ONLYFANS trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and uses the website to provide adult entertainment content in direct competition with the Complainant, allegedly including unauthorized watermarked content from the Complainant's users. In the Complainant's view, the incorporation of its trademark together with "girls" creates a misleading impression of affiliation rather than legitimate fair use.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. It relies on the fame and longstanding use of the ONLYFANS trademark, the Respondent's use of a confusingly similar name to attract visitors to competing adult entertainment content, the alleged copying of user content, the use of privacy protection for the registration, and the absence of a reply to its June 26, 2026 cease-and-desist letter. The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 must prove that (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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant; the Panel must assess the record and may draw appropriate inferences under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel is satisfied that the Center discharged its responsibility under paragraph 2(a) of the Rules to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice of the Complaint to the Respondent. In accordance with paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it 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 shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, notably the registered ONLYFANS trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ONLYFANS trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1 section 1.7. The generic Top-Level Domain ".org" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms, here the term “girls” and a hyphen, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark 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

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.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its ONLYFANS trademark, and no evidence suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name, which combines the ONLYFANS trademark with the term “girls”, carries a risk of implied affiliation, as it suggests that the website offers content from creators active on the Complainant’s platform with the Complainant’s authorization. Moreover, the website at the disputed domain name presents itself as an archive of leaked intimate photographs available on the Complainant’s platform offered free of charge, and the Complainant alleges, without rebuttal, that it reproduces content taken from its users’ pages and bearing their watermarks. Such use, which freerides on the reputation of the ONLYFANS trademark to distribute content presented as leaked from the Complainant’s platform, is considered by the Panel as illegitimate, and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. In these circumstances, the Panel considers that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.5.1 and 2.13.1.

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 Panel notes that the Complainant’s ONLYFANS trademark was registered several years before the registration of the disputed domain name on March 28, 2026, and that prior UDRP panels have found that trademark to be internationally well-known among the relevant public. The selection of the trademark together with the word “girls” and the use of the disputed domain name for adult entertainment content, together with the website’s express references to the Complainant and its description of leaked content associated with creators on that platform, supports the conclusion that the Respondent was aware of

and targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.2.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ONLYFANS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of that website, which offers adult content in the same field as the Complainant's services, and as such, constitutes registration and use in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel also takes into account the Respondent's failure to reply to the cease-and-desist letter of June 26, 2026, its default in this proceeding, and the use of a privacy service. None of these circumstances establishes bad faith on its own, but, together with the nature of the disputed domain name and the use evidenced in the record, they further support the finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.6 and 4.3.

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 <onlyfans-girls.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nathalie Dreyfus/
Nathalie Dreyfus
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026