ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Fenix International Limited v. Whois Agent, Netlify Inc
Case No. D2026-4053

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Whois Agent, Netlify Inc, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fansonlycreators.org> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 9, 2026. On September 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 11, 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, Domain Protection Services, Inc.") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 11, 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 September 11, 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 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 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Nels T. Lippert 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 owns and operates the website located at the domain name <onlyfans.com> and uses the domain name in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content. According to the Complainant's Annual Report and Consolidated Financial Statements for the Year Ended November 30, 2023, the "www.onlyfans.com" website is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users.

In the United States the Complainant has registered the ONLYFANS and ONLYFANS.COM word marks in various classes. The Complainant also has registered its lock logo and OF design marks in the United States. In the European Union and the United Kingdom, the Complainant has registered the ONLYFANS word and design marks. In addition, the Complainant holds International Registrations of the word and design marks that that been extended to many countries. Examples of the Complainant's trademark registrations are:

ONLYFANS, United States Registration No. 5769267, registered June 4, 2019.
ONLYFANS, United States Registration No. 6253455, registered January 26, 2021.
ONLYFANS, European Union Registration No. 017912377, registered January 9, 2019.

The Complainant registered the <onlyfans.com> domain name on January 29, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 6, 2026. At the time of the complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that arranges for subscriptions to exclusive content.

The Respondent is a Whois privacy agent.

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 Complainant's registered trademark because it consists of the ONLYFANS mark in reversed format and only adds the descriptive term "creators".

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no affiliation, sponsorship or connection with the Complainant and has not been permitted by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent was not commonly known by the disputed domain name and does not hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent was not making a bona fide offering of goods or services because the website to which the disputed domain name resolves also contains a logo that is similar to the Complainant's registered OF logo. The Complainant argues that the use of the Complainant's logo and trade mark evidences the Respondent is attempting to create confusion with the Complainant's domain name and trademarks.

In addition, the Complainant contends that given the well-known reputation of its mark, the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its ONLYFANS mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to offer services in direct competition with the Complainant, including providing user-generated content which competes with the Complainant's user's content. Even if the services are considered unrelated, the Complainant argues that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's trademarks and engaged in bad faith by registering a confusingly similar domain name. The Complainant further asserts bad faith because the Respondent failed to respond to a cease-and-desist letter that was sent to the Respondent on June 29, 2026. Finally, the Complaint argues that the Respondent's use of a privacy WhoIs service further evidences bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As noted above, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's contentions. Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a default by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint. The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstance in this case.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest a respondent of a domain name, a complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(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.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint 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".

In this case, the Panel finds that as a result of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant. By failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent failed to provide any information or reasoning that might rebut the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. Here, the disputed domain name constitutes the ONLYFANS mark in reversed format. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms here, "creators" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well established that the applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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 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 marks have been recognized internationally and are well-known by the relevant public. The relevant evidence indicates that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's mark when it registered the disputed domain name and used the disputed domain name to provide products and services in direct competition with the Complainant. The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. This finding is further supported by the lack of the Respondent' rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

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, but other circumstances may 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.

Here the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint and to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and the registration of the disputed domain name under a privacy shield are further evidence of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6.

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 <fansonlycreators.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nels T. Lippert/
Nels T. Lippert
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026