ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. mckin leyde1
Case No. D2026-1581

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.online> 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 (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 18, 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Kružliak as the sole panelist in this matter on May 29, 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 a publicly traded company based in United States operating for more than 165 years in the field of glass science, ceramic science, and optical physics. The Complainant generated USD 11.29 billion in revenue in 2018, and over USD 30 billion between 2016 and 2018.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous CORNING trademark registrations in many jurisdictions of the world, including the following:

– United States trademark registration CORNING (word), number 545056, registered on July 17, 1951, for classes 19 and 21;
– Chinese trademark registration CORNING (word), number 3205064, registered on October 14, 2003, for class 11.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous CORNING WARE trademark registrations in many jurisdictions of the world, including the following:

– United States trademark registration CORNING WARE (word), number 1144221, registered on December 23, 1980, for class 21;
– Chinese trademark registration CORNINGWARE (word), number 5591587, registered on September 14, 2009, for class 21.

The Complainant also uses <corning.com> as the domain name for its website.

The disputed domain name <corningwares.online> was created on January 8, 2026, and based on available record it resolves to a page containing pay-per-click links.

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 and the whole of the famous CORNING element of the Complainant's trademarks. The fact that the disputed domain name includes the letter "s" does nothing to diminish confusion, thus the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with the CORNING and CORNING WARE trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainants further submit that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has ever used, or demonstrated preparations to use, the disputed domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name resolves to a pay-per-click website that displays sponsored links to competitors of the Complainant, while also allowing end users to search for products that rival, or compete with, the Complainant, which puts the Respondent in a position to reap a financial benefit and constitutes prima facie evidence of no rights. And 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.

And finally, the Complainants assert that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith, since the disputed domain name is likely to confuse potential consumers into believing that the Respondent is somehow affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. The disputed domain name has been made to resolve to a pay-per-click website, which puts the Respondent and Registrar in a position to reap a financial benefit and accordingly, the disputed domain name is being used in an attempt to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Given the nature of the disputed domain name, there can be no doubt that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the CORNING and CORNING WARE trademarks at the time of registration, thereby supporting 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 CORNING and CORNING WARE trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name reproduces CORNING WARE trademarks in their entirety. The addition of the letter "s" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity in relation to the CORNING WARE trademarks of the Complainant. The addition of letter "s" at the end, indicating plural form, seems to be a clear case of typosquatting. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

The Panel notes that the Top-Level Domain of the disputed domain name - ".online" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such are disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to CORNING WARE trademarks. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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 available record does not show any trademark registrations or earlier relevant rights of the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name, nor the fact that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the described use of the disputed domain name by resolving to a page containing pay-per-click links is not noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, as it is intended for commercial gain, and misleadingly diverts customers who are aware of the Complainant's trademarks. 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 Complainant has provided evidence to show that registration and use of its CORNING and CORNING WARE trademarks long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant's trademarks are not associated with the Respondent in any way, however the Respondent was a party to previous UDRP cases involving abusive registration of the Complainant's trademarks (see *Corning Incorporated v. mckin leyde1*, WIPO Case No. D2026-1577). Considering this and 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.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a page containing pay-per-click links, thus diverting Internet users looking for the Complainant for commercial gain, which clearly falls within the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and, together with the aforementioned findings, demonstrates registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.5.

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.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Kružliak/
Peter Kružliak
Sole Panelist
Date: June 12, 2026