

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. bestlink company, peter wu
Case No. D2025-4297

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Corning Incorporated, United States of America (the “United States” or “US”), represented by Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is bestlink company, peter wu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corning-us.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 20, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On October 21, 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 October 22, 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 October 22, 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 October 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on November 25, 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

The Complainant is a US publicly traded company (listed on New York Stock Exchange: GLW) and one of the world's leading innovators in materials science, with a history spanning more than 165 years. The Complainant specialises in glass science, ceramic science, and optical physics to develop products that transform industries. In 2018, the Complainant generated USD 11.29 billion in revenue.

The Complainant is the owner of over 300 trademark registrations worldwide for trademarks consisting of or containing the word CORNING, including for example:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 618649 for CORNING, registered January 3, 1956;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 918421 for CORNING, registered August 17, 1971;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 1682729 for CORNING, registered April 14, 1992;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 1748228 for CORNING, registered January 26, 1993;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 016966822 for CORNING, registered on November 6, 2017;
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA186211 for CORNING, registered October 20, 1972; and
- Chinese Trademark Registration No. 576489 for CORNING, registered December 20, 1991.

These trademarks are referred to as the "CORNING trademark" in this decision.

The Complainant owns the domain name <corning.com> which resolves to its principal website.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on October 8, 2025, and does not resolve to an active website.

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 as follows.

The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CORNING trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the CORNING trademark in its entirety, with only the addition of a hyphen, the geographic indicator "us", and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The addition of these elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant further contends that, the addition of "us" enhances confusion by suggesting a United States-specific website of the Complainant.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the CORNING trademark, and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the fame of the CORNING trademark and the nature of the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent must have had actual knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration. The Disputed Domain Name is inactive, constituting passive holding. The Respondent's registration and use falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the

Policy, as any future use of the Disputed Domain Name would inevitably create confusion with the Complainant's trademark and attract Internet users for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to succeed in an administrative proceeding:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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

The Panel finds that the Complainant has rights in the CORNING trademark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's CORNING trademark in its entirety. The only additions are a hyphen, the two-letter geographic indicator "us", and the gTLD ".com".

The Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CORNING trademark. Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark for purposes of the Policy "when the domain name includes the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation, regardless of the other terms in the domain name" (see *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#)). It is established that, where a mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is considered to be confusingly similar to the mark (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") at section 1.7).

It is also established that the addition of a geographic term (such as here "us") to a disputed domain name would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the domain name and the mark ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at section 1.8).

It is also well established that the gTLD, in this case ".com", is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at section 1.11.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and hence the first condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

- (i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trade mark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant has not authorised, licensed, or permitted the Respondents to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use the CORNING trademark. The Complainant has prior rights in the CORNING trademark which precede the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has therefore established a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and thereby the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to produce evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name (see for example *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#); *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#)).

The Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to produce any evidence to establish any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used 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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. First, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its CORNING trademark at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name. The CORNING trademark has been in continuous use since the 19th century and is supported by an extensive international trademark portfolio with registrations predating the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by many decades. The Complainant is a publicly traded company with billions of dollars in annual revenue. The Disputed Domain Name consists of the Complainant's trademark in its entirety combined with a hyphen and geographic term for the United States – "us", which is where the Complainant is based. It is in the Panel's opinion more likely than not that the Respondent selected this particular combination with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights, which supports a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2. In reaching this conclusion the Panel acknowledges that the word "orning" is an English word, in the Panel's opinion it is a relatively obscure word and nothing in the record suggests an intent other than to take advantage of the Complainant's well-known trademark.

Second, the Disputed Domain Name has not been put to any active use since its registration. However, the passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. UDRP panels have found that the apparent lack of active use of a domain name by a respondent does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith. Passive holding can itself amount to bad faith registration and use where the holding involves a domain name deliberately chosen because of its association with the Complainant. See *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#), *Jupiters Limited v. Aaron Hall*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0574](#), *Ladbroke Group Plc v. Sonoma International LDC*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0131](#), *Westdev Limited v. Private Data*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1903](#); *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#), and *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#). The panel must examine all the circumstances of the case to determine whether the respondent is acting in bad faith. Examples of what may be cumulative circumstances found to be indicative of bad faith include the complainant having a well-known trademark, no response to the complaint having been filed, and the registrant's concealment of its identity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The Complainant's CORNING trademark is demonstrably well-known and enjoys substantial international recognition. The Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint or provide any explanation for its registration of the Disputed Domain Name. These circumstances, viewed cumulatively, support a finding of bad faith passive holding.

Third, given the fame of the CORNING trademark and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, any future active use of the Disputed Domain Name would inevitably create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Internet users encountering the Disputed Domain Name would reasonably believe it to be associated with the Complainant, particularly given the addition of the geographic indicator "us" which suggests a United States-specific presence of the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been satisfied.

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-us.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nick J. Gardner/

Nick J. Gardner

Sole Panelist

Date: December 10, 2025