

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. Magnum Domains
Case No. DCO2025-0012

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Corning Incorporated, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Magnum Domains, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corning.co> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 3, 2025. On February 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 4, 2025, 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 February 5, 2025, 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 February 12, 2025.

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 February 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit a response. The Center notified the Respondent's default on March 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on March 10, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel 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 is one of the world's leading developers and producers of high-technology products in the glass and ceramic sectors.

In 2018 alone, the Complainant generated USD 11.29 billion in revenue, and over USD 30 billion between 2016 and 2018.

The Complainant has an extensive global portfolio of trade marks incorporating the name CORNING, including the following:

- United States Registration No. 618649 in Classes 9 and 21, registered on January 3, 1956;
- United States Registration No. 918421 in Class 11, registered on August 17, 1971; and
- United States Registration No. 1682729 in Class 9, registered on April 14, 1992.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 20, 2010.

The evidence provided by the Complainant indicates that, at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a page offering to sell the disputed domain name. The Complainant also submitted further evidence indicating that the disputed domain name was listed for sale on the website of the Registrar for USD 7,025.99.

At the time of issuance of this Decision, the disputed domain name continued to resolve to the same website offering the disputed domain name for sale.

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 registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's CORNING trade marks, and that the addition of the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") does not affect the analysis as to whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade marks.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the CORNING mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has any connection to the CORNING mark in any way, and that there is no plausible good-faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling, renting, licensing, or otherwise transferring it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the actual costs in registering the name. The Complainant therefore argues that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the CORNING trade marks in many jurisdictions around the world.

Disregarding the TLD ".co", the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark CORNING in its entirety. Thus, the disputed domain name should be regarded as identical to the Complainant's CORNING trade mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant satisfies the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the CORNING trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain name is identical to its mark.

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 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade marks and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Meanwhile, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the Respondent, prior to the notice of the dispute, had used or demonstrated its preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

There is also no evidence adduced to show that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. As such, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie

showing of the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that none of the circumstances of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy is applicable in this case.

Accordingly, and based on the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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 states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1).

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

When the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the CORNING trade marks were already widely known and directly associated with the Complainant's activities.

Given the composition of the disputed domain name and the significant reputation of the Complainant's trade marks, and absent evidence or explanation of rights or legitimate interests from the Respondent, the Panel finds the Respondent's efforts to sell the disputed domain name indicate a bad faith intention to profit by reselling the disputed domain name to the Complainant or other parties at a price likely exceeding the Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses related to the disputed domain name. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <corning.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: March 25, 2025