

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. Susan Leobb, Jago
Case No. D2026-1611

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Susan Leobb, Jago, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <coroning.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 15, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 16, 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) 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 Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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 one of the world's leading innovators in materials science, with a more than 165-year track record of life-changing inventions. The Complainant applies its expertise in glass science, ceramic science, and optical physics along with its deep manufacturing and engineering capabilities to develop category-defining products that transform industries and enhance people's lives.

In 2018 alone, the Complainant generated USD 11.29 billion in revenue, and over USD 30 billion between 2016 and 2018.

The Complainant operates a website at "corning.com".

The Complainant is the owner of over 325 trademark registrations worldwide for trademarks comprised of, or containing, CORNING (collectively, the "CORNING Trademarks"). These include:

CORNING, United States of America Reg. No. 618649, registered on January 3, 1956; CORNING, United States of America Reg No, 918421, registered on August 17, 1971; and CORNING, United States of America Reg. No 1682729, registered on April 14, 1992.

Without the permission of the Complainant, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on March 19, 2026.

According to the Complaint, the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name for email addresses like "[...].@corning.com" with the name of an employee of a company affiliated with the Complainant and using "cc.emea" as part of another email address, the Respondent has been masquerading as the Complainant issuing email correspondence to unsuspecting clients of the Complainant directing them to pay fake invoices.

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 is nearly identical to the Complainant's registered CORNING trademarks. Furthermore, the whole of the CORNING element of the CORNING Trademarks is incorporated in the disputed domain name. This supports a finding of confusion. Further engaging in typosquatting activities undermines a claim of legitimate interest or rights. Moreover impersonating a complainant by using a disputed domain name as part of an email address in the furtherance of a fraudulent scheme constitutes prima facie evidence of no rights.

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name constitutes a clear case of typosquatting as the Respondent has intentionally misspelled the famous CORNING trademark by adding the letter "o" after the letter "r". The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to source or sponsorship, which serves to support a finding of bad faith. Further, the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name as an instrument of fraud.

Using email addresses connected to the disputed domain name like “[...]@corning.com”, the Respondent has been masquerading as the Complainant issuing email correspondence to unsuspecting clients of the Complainant directing them to pay fake invoices.

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 a trademark or service mark 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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The misspelling of the famous CORNING trademark by adding the letter “o” after the letter “r” does not affect the confusing similarity. [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 evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name has been used for an illegitimate activity, and the Respondent did not provide any explanation for the registration and use of 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes the Complainant's claim that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract for commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Here, the Complainant claims that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name as part of a fraudulent scheme to unlawfully extract money from unsuspecting third parties believing the Respondent to be the Complainant. Using the disputed domain name as part of an email address that is virtually identical to that of the Complainant which creates the false impression that the email was sent by the Complainant, when in fact it was not. The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, its similarity with the Complainant's domain name, that the Respondent did not rebut the Complainant's contentions, and that the disputed domain name does not resolve currently to an active website.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <coroning.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026