

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fenix International Limited v. Ronald Kelechi
Case No. D2026-4027

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ronald Kelechi, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyfanscave.site> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (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 the same day, 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 (Privacy User #f2e24a83, See PrivacyGuardian.org) 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 submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Manuel Wegrostek as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 operates a social media platform under the name “OnlyFans” that enables users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web. The Complainant has operated this platform for several years. The Complainant’s website at “www.onlyfans.com” is currently one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for ONLYFANS (the “ONLYFANS Trademark”), including:

- European Union Trade mark Registration No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019;
- United Kingdom Trade mark Registration No. UK00917912377, registered on January 9, 2019; and,
- United States Trademark Registration No. 5769267, registered on June 4, 2019.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 28, 2026. At the time of the Decision, and when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an active English-language website, prominently displaying the sign “OnlyFansCave”, incorporating the ONLYFANS Trademark and describing itself as a platform connecting content creators with their fans and offering adult content, i.e. in the field in which the Complainant operates under the ONLYFANS Trademark, and claiming to have more than 500,000 creators and more than 2 million members. The website further invited Internet users to sign up and create an account. The footer of the website contained the copyright notice “© 2026 OnlyFansCave. All rights reserved.”, incorporating the ONLYFANS Trademark. The website did not disclose the absence of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

On June 29, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent demanding that the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent did not reply.

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.

On the first element of the Policy, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is identical – or, at the least, confusingly similar – to the ONLYFANS Trademark. The disputed domain name consists of the ONLYFANS Trademark with the only difference being the addition of the meaningless or otherwise descriptive term “cave” after the ONLYFANS Trademark, which does nothing to avoid confusing similarity. The use of the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.site” does not change the result.

On the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the ONLYFANS Trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent is not commonly known by the ONLYFANS Trademark and does not hold any trademarks for

the disputed domain name. The website at the disputed domain name arranges for subscriptions to adult content in direct competition with the Complainant's registered services. Using a disputed domain name to host commercial websites that advertise goods and services in direct competition with the Complainant does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests. The Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name not because it refers to or is associated with the Respondent, but because the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's <onlyfans.com> domain name and the ONLYFANS Trademark in association with the Complainant's services.

On the third element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant attained registered rights in the ONLYFANS Trademark. The widespread commercial recognition of the ONLYFANS Trademark is such that the Respondent must have had knowledge of the trademark before registering the disputed domain name. Given the wholesale adoption of the ONLYFANS Trademark in the disputed domain name, it is difficult to conceive of any use that the Respondent might make of the disputed domain name without the Complainant's consent that would not involve bad faith. Because there is no benign reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name, it is clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to target the ONLYFANS Trademark. The disputed domain name directs to a commercial website that offers adult entertainment content in direct competition with the Complainant's services. Further, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on June 29, 2026 demanding the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not respond, thus necessitating the filing of this Complaint. The Respondent also hid from the public behind a Whois privacy wall. Moreover, the footer of the website at the disputed domain name contains a copyright statement bearing the ONLYFANS Trademark: "© 2026 OnlyFansCave. All rights reserved."

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires that the Panel's decision be made "on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

The Complainant must establish each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the Complaint with respect to the disputed domain name, namely 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.

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 applicable TLD in a domain name (e.g., “.site”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain name contains the ONLYFANS Trademark in its entirety with the only difference being the addition of the word “cave”. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise), in this case the term “cave”, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. The Panel therefore finds that 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.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the ONLYFANS Trademark. The Panel finds that there are no indications that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or otherwise has any rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name was not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the disputed domain name incorporated the Complainant’s mark and directed users to competing services, as it resolved to an active English-language website, prominently displaying the sign “OnlyFansCave”, incorporating the ONLYFANS Trademark and describing itself as a platform connecting content creators with their fans and offering adult content, i.e. in the field in which the Complainant operates under the ONLYFANS Trademark. The website further invited Internet users to sign up and create an account, and its footer contained a copyright notice, incorporating the ONLYFANS Trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3. The website did not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant, thus Internet users may fall under the false impression that the Respondent might be authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant.

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 Panel finds that 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.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Moreover, panels have found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: (i) actual confusion; (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful; (iii) the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name; (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer; (v) redirecting the domain name to or mimicking the complainant's (or a competitor's) website; and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the ONLYFANS Trademark in its entirety, with the only addition of the word "cave". Considering the distinctiveness and public awareness of the ONLYFANS Trademark, Internet users may assume the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant and would resolve to a website related to the Complainant. Further, the disputed domain name resolved to an active English-language website, prominently displaying the sign "OnlyFansCave", incorporating the ONLYFANS Trademark and describing itself as a platform connecting content creators with their fans and offering adult content, i.e. in the field in which the Complainant operates under the ONLYFANS Trademark. Moreover, the website invited Internet users to sign up and create an account, and its footer contained a copyright notice, incorporating the ONLYFANS Trademark. The website linked to the disputed domain name did not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent did not submit a response to the Complaint and, according to the Complainant, did not reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter either. As shown above, the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The evidence leads to the conclusion that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ONLYFANS Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <onlyfanscave.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Wegrostek/

Manuel Wegrostek

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2026