ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Fenix International Limited v. Moumita Khatun
Case No. D2026-4086

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Moumita Khatun, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <onlyphans.xyz> 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 11, 2026. On September 14, 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 16, 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 16, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Manuel Wegrostek as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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 Trademark Registration No. 017912377, registered on January 9, 2019;

- United Kingdom Trademark 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 May 9, 2026. At the time of the Decision, and when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an active English-language website offering adult entertainment content on a subscription basis, i.e., in the field in which the Complainant operates under the ONLYFANS Trademark. The website displayed posts by creator profiles whose content was blurred and locked with the notice "You must subscribe to view this post", and invited Internet users to log in or sign up via a "Getting started" button. The website did not disclose the absence of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

On July 13, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent demanding that the Respondent stop using and cancelling 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 very least, confusingly similar – to the ONLYFANS Trademark. Confusing similarity exists where the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of marks, such as here where the "f" sound from "OnlyFans" is provided by the "ph" letters in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name mimics the sound and look of the ONLYFANS Trademark with only the addition of the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".xyz".

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 trademark owner does not give rise to legitimate rights or interests.

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. 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. Here, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the ONLYFANS Trademark. The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on July 13, 2026, demanding that the Respondent stop using and cancelling the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not respond, thus necessitating the filing of this Complaint. The Respondent's failure to respond to this correspondence is further evidence of bad faith. The Respondent also hid from the public behind a WhoIs privacy wall. Moreover, the disputed domain name directs to a commercial website that offers adult entertainment content and subscription services in direct competition with the Complainant's services in the field of adult entertainment.

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., ".xyz") 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 with the only difference being the replacement of the letter "f" with the letters "ph", which is aurally identical. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. Further, a domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) 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.

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 reproduces the Complainant's mark with the only difference being the replacement of the letter "f" with the letters "ph" and resolved to an active English-language website offering adult entertainment content on a subscription basis, i.e., in the field in which the Complainant operates under the ONLYFANS Trademark. The website displayed subscription-locked posts and invited Internet users to log in or sign up. 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 reproduces the ONLYFANS Trademark, with the only difference being the replacement of the letter “f” with the letters “ph”. Considering the distinctiveness and public awareness of the ONLYFANS Trademark, Internet users may assume the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant as they may not notice the subtle difference as described above in the disputed domain name and would resolve to a website related to the Complainant. Further, the disputed domain name resolved to an active English-language website, offering adult entertainment content on a subscription basis, i.e., in the field in which the Complainant operates under the ONLYFANS Trademark. The website displayed subscription-locked posts and invited Internet users to log in or sign up. 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 further used a privacy service to shield its identity. While the use of such a service is not in itself indicative of bad faith, the Panel considers it, in the circumstances of this case, as an additional factor in its overall assessment of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6. 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 <onlyphans.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Wegrostek/
Manuel Wegrostek
Sole Panelist
Date: October 30, 2026