

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. Domain Administrator,
Fundacion Privacy Services Ltd.
Case No. D2026-1561

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services Ltd., Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <truebluecorning.com> is registered with Media Elite Holdings Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 13, 2026. On April 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 14, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Paula Bezerra de Menezes as the sole panelist in this matter on May 27, 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 based in the United States of America and operates in the materials science field, with a more than 165-year track record of life-changing inventions. It invests in research and development and offers solutions such as pharmaceutical glass packaging that prevents cracks and improves the quality of pharmaceutical packaging.

The Complainant owns many trademark registrations across different jurisdictions, such as:

- Registration No. 618,649, CORNING, in classes 9, 19, and 21, to cover inter alia glass laboratory equipment and kitchenware, registered on January 3, 1956, in the United States of America;¹ and
- Registration No. 016966822, CORNING, in various classes such as 21, to cover inter alia unprocessed glass and semi worked glass to form cartridges or other containers in which pharmaceutical products may be kept, registered on November 6, 2017, in the European Union.

The Complainant operates the domain name <corning.com>.

The disputed domain name <truebluecorning.com> was registered on November 25, 2019.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a gambling website. There is also evidence that suggests the disputed domain name was offered for sale at USD 1,599, and also resolved to a pay-per-click ("PPC") website, with links such as "Advanced Glass Solutions" and "High-Quality Glassware Brands".

The Respondent was identified as Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services Ltd. with an address in Panama.

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:

- i) The Respondent's disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its famous mark CORNING, because it incorporates the relevant mark in its entirety;
- ii) The Respondent registered the disputed domain name without the Complainant's permission;
- iii) Moreover, the addition of "trueblue" to the Complainant's mark enhances the confusion, because "trueblue" is a term used to describe something that is genuine;

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record (such as accessing trademark registration databases) if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

- iv) Consumers are likely to believe that the disputed domain name resolves to a page operated by, or connected to, the Complainant;
- v) The disputed domain name resolves to a gambling website, and it was also listed for sale for an excessive price;
- vi) Its mark was used to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion between the Respondent and the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for the transfer of the disputed domain name the Complainant must establish 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.

The Rules provide that if the Respondent does not comply with the time periods established, or with any provision or requirement under paragraph 14 of the Rules, the panel shall proceed to a decision on the complaint and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate.

Pursuant to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, a panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The Panel has reviewed the case and found the following:

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 here, "trueblue", 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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent used the disputed domain name with a bona fide offering, was commonly known by the disputed domain name or was using the disputed domain name with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use purpose.

On the contrary, there is evidence that the disputed domain name was used to host alternatively a gambling website, offered for sale, and a parked page comprising PPC links associated with the Complainant’s expertise area, namely, glass and advanced glass solutions, which does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

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 has used the disputed domain name in connection with a PPC website containing links that explicitly referred to the Complainant’s expertise area, namely, glass and advanced glass solutions, which indicates that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users 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 the Respondent’s website or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.

Moreover, in the present case, the evidence also demonstrates that it is more probable than not that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name targeting the trademark owner to take unfair advantage and sell it at a profit because the trademark is distinctive and longstanding, and is entirely comprised in the disputed domain name, while the resale of the disputed domain name was announced at a price likely in excess of the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs. Paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1. The Panel also notes in this regard that the Respondent has been involved in a number of UDRP decisions with adverse decisions against it. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#),

section 3.1.2. See also *Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1670](#).

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel considers the following additional bad faith factors:

- (a) the reproduction of the Complainant's distinctive, longstanding and well reputed registered mark in its entirety with an additional term that enhances confusing similarity to the Complainant's mark; and
- (b) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use.

Given the above, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the Respondent intentionally registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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 <truebluecorning.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Paula Bezerra de Menezes/

Paula Bezerra de Menezes

Sole Panelist

Date: June 10, 2026