

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. mckin leyde1
Case No. D2026-1577

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is mckin leyde1, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corningwares.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 14, 2026. On April 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 17, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD) 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on May 26, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant, a publicly traded company, is one of the world's leading innovators in materials science, with a more than 165-year track record of life-changing inventions. The Complainant develops products in glass science, ceramic science, and optical physics. In 2018 alone, the Complainant generated USD 11.29 billion in revenue.

The Complainant is the owner of many trademark registrations worldwide, comprised of, or containing, CORNING, or CORNING WARE, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 618649 for CORNING (word), registered on January 3, 1956, in international classes 26 and 33;
- Chinese Trademark Registration No. 576489 for CORNING (word), registered on December 20, 1991, in international class 9;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 1144221 for CORNING WARE (word), registered on December 23, 1980, in international class 21;
- Chinese Trademark Registration No. 5591587 for CORNING WARE (word), registered on September 14, 2009, in international class 21.

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

The disputed domain name was registered on January 8, 2026, and according to evidence with the Complaint, it resolved to a website displaying the trademark CORNING WARE and claiming to be a "CorningWare® Official Site" purporting to present for sale various products developed by the Complainant. The postings resolved to Amazon, where CORNING products and competing products were offered for sale. The website at the disputed domain name included a copyright notice: "Copyright © 2026 corningwares.com, All rights reserved". At the date of this decision, the disputed domain name redirects to a website at <corningwareproduct.com> having a similar content as before this redirection, displaying a button with "Check price on Amazon" where CORNING products and competing ones are offered for sale.

The Respondent appears to be located in China.

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 incorporates the whole of the CORNING WARE trademark of the Complainant. Furthermore, the famous CORNING trademark of the Complainant is incorporated in the disputed domain name. The fact that the disputed domain name includes the letter "s" does nothing to diminish confusion.

As regards the second element of the Policy, the Complainant argues that there has never been any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Respondent is not licensed, or otherwise authorized, be it directly or indirectly, to register or use, the CORNING trademarks of the Complainant in any manner whatsoever, including in, or as part of, a domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website engaged in the wholesale and flagrant misappropriation of the Complainant's CORNING trademarks. The Respondent refers to itself as "CorningWares" and its website features postings promoting the sale of

various Corning products. The postings resolve to Amazon, where the Respondent is promoting the sale of Corning products as well as direct competitor products, including Umite, Lodge, Vorringard and Nuwave. The Complainant concludes that under these circumstances, the Respondent cannot claim the benefit of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent is making, or intends to make, a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name to claim benefit of paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name contains its CORNING WARE trademark, as well as its famous CORNING trademark. Furthermore, the disputed domain name suggests that it is connected to the Complainant. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is likely to confuse consumers into believing that the Respondent is somehow affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant, because it registered the disputed domain name to redirect Internet traffic to a website competing with, or rivaling, the Complainant by using a domain name containing, or comprised of, a complainant's trademark. Further, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that is promoting the sale of competitor products, including, without limitation, Umite , Lodge, Vorringard and Nuwave.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Accordingly, the Panel considers it can proceed to determine the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant as per paragraph 15(a) of the Rules. The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark CORNING WARE for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is virtually identical to the CORNING WARE trademark but for the addition of the letter “s” creating a plural version of the Complainant’s trademark. The addition of the letter “s” to the CORNING WARE trademark is a common form of typosquatting. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 in the record that the Respondent used or is currently using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does the Respondent appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy. Rather, the disputed domain name was used to resolve to a web page displaying the Complainant’s CORNING WARE trademark and displaying postings about the Complainant’s products. According to the uncontested evidence produced by the Complainant, these postings resolve to Amazon, where the CORNING products as well as direct competitor products are offered for sale. The current redirection of the disputed domain name is essentially the same.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name (a misspelled version of the Complainant’s trademark), together with the display of the Complainant’s CORNING WARE trademark on the website at the disputed domain name, coupled with the use of the disputed domain name, signals the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

The Respondent is reportedly called “mckin leyde1” and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant’s contentions, claiming any 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.

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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has provided evidence to show that registration and use of its CORNING WARE trademarks long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Thus, given the evidence in the case file, the Panel finds it highly unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks, given the reputation of the Complainant and the composition of the disputed domain name and also given the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's CORNING WARE word trademark and directing to Amazon where the Complainant's goods are offered together with those of its competitors. The Panel finds on balance that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's trademark.

As regards the use, the Respondent reproduced the Complainant's trademark on the website associated with the disputed domain name and purported via the redirection to the Amazon platform to offer similar goods. Moreover, the website at the disputed domain name includes a misleading copyright notice, which tends to falsely indicate an affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant. By doing so, it is clear the Respondent was intentionally seeking to attract Internet users for commercial gain through the creation of a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The finding of bad faith is further supported by the mention included on the website at the disputed domain name according to which "The site is a participant in the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program, an affiliate advertising program designed to provide a means for sites to earn advertising fees by advertising and linking to Amazon.com."

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 <corningwares.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026