ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Fenix International Limited v. Huang Hui, Ndb
Case No. D2026-4082

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fenix International Limited, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Walters Law Group, United States.

The Respondent is Huang Hui, Ndb, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 10, 2026. On September 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 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 September 15, 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 amended Complaint on September 15, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Gregory N. Albright 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 <onlyfans.com> through which the Complainant allows users to post and subscribe to audiovisual content on the World Wide Web. The Complainant registered the domain name <onlyfans.com> on January 29, 2013.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for its ONLYFANS brand including: European Union registration number 017912377 registered on January 9, 2019, for ONLYFANS; United Kingdom registration number UK00917912377 registered on January 9, 2019, for ONLYFANS; and United States registration number 5769267 registered on June 4, 2019, for ONLYFANS.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on May 6, 2026, and resolves to a website offering directly competing adult entertainment services.

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.

First, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark, in which the Complainant has established rights. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's entire ONLYFANS mark with mere addition of the term "free" and the ".shop" Top-Level Domain ("TLD"). Those additions do not dispel confusing similarity with the Complainant's mark.

Second, the Complainant contends the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether expressed or implied, to use the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark in a domain name or otherwise. The Complainant further contends the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is using the disputed domain name to host a commercial website that advertises services in competition with the Complainant.

Finally, the Respondent has registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant asserts. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in May 2026, many years after the Complainant obtained registrations for its ONLYFANS mark. In addition, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on June 29, 2026, demanding that the Respondent stop using and cancel the disputed domain name, but the Respondent did not respond or cancel the disputed domain name as requested. The Complainant also asserts the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant's website to a site offering adult entertainment content in direct competition with the Complainant's platform. Bad faith is also present, the Complainant argues, because the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering infringing domain names, or serial cybersquatting; the Respondent in this case was also the Respondent in *Fenix International Limited v. Huang Hui, Ndb*, WIPO Case No. D2025-4639 (<onlyfans-xnxx.rest>).

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

"The applicable TLD in a domain name (e.g., '.com', '.club', '.nyc') 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 therefore disregards the ".shop" TLD in the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms – here, "free" – 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.

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. Hence, there is no evidence of the circumstances listed in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that this is the second UDRP proceeding involving the Respondent's registration of disputed domain names that incorporate the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark. This pattern of registering domain names targeting the Complainant's trademarks is a factor supporting the conclusion that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.3 (Panels consider "whether the respondent has engaged in a pattern of trademark-abusive domain name registrations").

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.

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.

The Panel first finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith on May 6, 2026, years after the Complainant obtained registrations of the ONLYFANS mark, including in the United States where the Respondent is located. The Complainant has also adduced evidence that its <onlyfans.com> website is one of the most popular websites in the world, with more than 305 million registered users. The Complainant's well-known mark is therefore a prime target for cybersquatters; the Complaint lists over 150 other UDRP decisions which resulted in cancellation or transfer of domain names to the Complainant. These facts support the conclusion that the Respondent knowingly registered a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark to give Internet users the false impression that the Respondent's website is affiliated with, sponsored by, or licensed by the Complainant, and to trade on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark.

Including for the foregoing reasons, the Panel also finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Notably, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct; the disputed domain name at issue in this proceeding is the second domain name the Respondent has registered and used that incorporates the Complainant's ONLYFANS mark. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2. ("UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registrations.").

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.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gregory N. Albright/
Gregory N. Albright
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026