

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. niu youguo
Case No. D2025-3628

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is niu youguo, U.S.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corningonline.shop> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Spaceship, Inc.
(the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 8, 2025. On September 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 9, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy Purposes) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 10, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on the same date.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 5, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on October 13, 2025. 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

Complainant, having been in operations for over 165 years, is in the manufacturing and engineering business involving glass science, ceramic science, and optical physics. In 2018, Complainant generated USD 11.29 billion in revenue, and over USD 30 billion between 2016 and 2018.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks with the CORNING mark worldwide, including:

- U.S. registered trademark number 618649 for the CORNING word mark, registered on January 3, 1956;
- U.S. registered trademark number 918421 for the CORNING word mark, registered on August 17, 1971;
- Canadian registered trademark number TMA240498 for the CORNING word mark, registered on March 7, 1980;
- Chinese registered trademark number 576489 for the CORNING word mark, registered on December 20, 1991; and
- Australian registered trademark number 130807 for the CORNING word mark, registered on January 29, 1957.

Complainant also owns and operates a website at “www.corning.com”.

The Domain Name was registered on August 6, 2025, and at the time of filing of the Complaint, resolved to a website clearly listing CORNING in its header or banner and throughout the website, featuring and promoting the sale of Complainant’s CORNING products, displaying Complainant’s trademarks, as well as promoting products from Complainant’s competitors. The website also featured “Corning Ware Authentics” along with “Exclusive Offers & Discounts”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations for CORNING, and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known CORNING products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, that Respondent is using the Domain Name as a tool to exploit Complainant’s reputation for its own commercial gain, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Further, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant’s rights.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

To prevail, Complainant has to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1. Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the CORNING trademarks, as noted above under section 4. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the CORNING trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the CORNING trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLD") in which the respective Domain Name is registered (in this case, ".shop"), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's CORNING trademarks. The CORNING trademarks are recognizable in the Domain Name.

In particular, the Domain Name's inclusion of Complainant's CORNING trademarks in their entirety, with an addition of the term "-online" in the Domain Name, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the CORNING trademarks. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes out such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its CORNING trademarks when registering the Domain Name and does not have any rights or legitimate

interests in the Domain Name. In addition, Complainant asserts that Respondent is not authorized to promote Complainant's goods or services and is not related to Complainant. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the CORNING trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name, or has acquired trademark or service mark rights in the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a website clearly listing CORNING in its header or banner and throughout the website, featuring and promoting the sale of Complainant's CORNING products, displaying Complainant's trademarks, as well as promoting products from Complainant's competitors. The website also featured "Corning Ware Authentics" along with "Exclusive Offers & Discounts".

Moreover, the Panel notes that the Domain Name includes Complainant's trademark CORNING, with the term "-online" and, as such, is not only similar to Complainant's own domain name <corning.com> and trademarks, but is inherently misleading and carries a risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Such composition of the Domain Name affirms Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Name and Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites at the Domain Name, which does not confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name to rebut Complainant's prima facie case.

Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a domain name registrant, namely:

"(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location."

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that the registrations of the CORNING trademarks well predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well

established and known. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's CORNING trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized.

Therefore, the Panel is of the view that Respondent was aware of the CORNING trademarks when it registered the Domain Name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2; see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

In particular, the registration of the Domain Name incorporating Complainant's CORNING trademarks in their entirety suggests Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant's rights in the CORNING trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name and its effort to opportunistically capitalize on the registration and use of the Domain Name. Further, UDRP 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 famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)

It is more likely than not that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for well-known CORNING products and services of Complainant or authorized partners of Complainant. The use of the CORNING trademarks in the Domain Name is intended to capture Internet traffic from Internet users who are looking for Complainant's products and services. The use of the Domain Name to divert users to a website featuring and promoting the sale of Complainant's CORNING products, displaying Complainant's trademarks, as well as promoting products from Complainant's competitors, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Essentially, by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known CORNING products and services of Complainant or authorized partners of Complainant to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's CORNING mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website.

Finally, the Panel also notes the reputation of the CORNING trademarks, and the failure of Respondent to submit a response to the Complaint or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith and Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <corningonline.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: October 22, 2025