

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. szjxkj szjxkj
Case No. D2026-1615

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is szjxkj szjxkj, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corningtech.net> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 16, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 16, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 17, 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 April 20, 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 April 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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 is Corning Incorporated, a company based in the United States. The record indicates that the Complainant operates internationally in the field of materials science and provides products and technologies used in sectors including communications, life sciences, environmental technologies, display technologies, and specialty materials.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations CORNING in various jurisdictions. These include, among others:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1,748,228 for CORNING, registered on January 26, 1993;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 016966822 for CORNING, registered on November 6, 2017, and
- Indian Trademark Registration No. 178213 for CORNING, applied for on January 28, 1957, and currently registered.

The record further reflects that the Complainant owns an extensive international trademark portfolio comprising registrations of the mark CORNING in multiple jurisdictions.

The Complainant operates its website at the domain name <corning.com>.

The disputed domain name <corningtech.net> was registered on February 25, 2026.

The evidence submitted with the Complaint shows that, at the time the evidence was collected, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website. The record does not otherwise disclose any active use of the disputed domain name.

According to the Registrar's verification response, the underlying registrant information disclosed by the Registrar indicates a registrant located in India.

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 it owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark CORNING worldwide and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to that trademark.

The disputed domain name incorporates its trademark in its entirety, differing only by the addition of the term "tech" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net". The Complainant argues that the addition of "tech" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and may even increase confusion, as the Complainant operates in technology-related fields and offers a variety of technology products and services.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has not authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services, or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It argues that its trademark has been used for many decades and is widely recognised in connection with its business and products. In light of the reputation of the CORNING trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant further argues that the addition of the term “tech” reinforces the association with the Complainant and its activities.

The Complainant also submits that the disputed domain name is inactive and that, in the circumstances of the case, such inactivity does not prevent a finding of 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 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.

Although the addition of other terms such as “tech” in the present case, 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 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 Complainant states that it has not authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The record further indicates that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and does not otherwise disclose any use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

When the domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (here "tech"), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Lastly, the Respondent has not submitted any Response or otherwise come forward with evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's CORNING trademark in its entirety together with the term "tech". The record does not disclose any apparent connection between the Respondent and the term "Corning", nor any explanation for the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name.

Having regard to the longstanding use of the CORNING trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the circumstances reflected in the record, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. In this regard, the addition of the term "tech" does not appear incidental but rather reinforces the association with the Complainant's technology-related business and fields of activity.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <corningtech.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026