

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. Anabelle Koepf
Case No. D2026-1991

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Anabelle Koepf, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corning-login.live> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2026. On May 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Bradley A. Slutsky as the sole panelist in this matter on June 11, 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

Complainant is a publicly traded United States corporation (NYSE: GLW) in the materials science industry, in fields such as glass science, ceramic science, and optical physics. Founded in 1851, Complainant's website notes that in 1879 Complainant developed a glass encasement for Thomas Edison's carbon filament light bulb and then invented an economical way to mass produce the bulbs, thus bringing electric light to the general population. According to Complainant's 2025 Form 10-K, Complainant made more than USD 15.6 billion in sales in 2025, more than USD 13 billion in sales in 2024, and more than USD 12.5 billion in sales in 2023.

Complainant has over 325 trademark registrations worldwide comprised of or containing the term CORNING. In the United States, these marks include the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. No.	Reg. Date	International Class(es)
CORNING	United States	545,056	July 17, 1951	19, 21
CORNING	United States	618,649	January 3, 1956	9, 19, 21
CORNING	United States	918,421	August 17, 1971	7, 11

Complainant also operates a website at <corning.com>, which was registered in 1991 and provides information about Complainant's products, technologies, and corporate activities.

Respondent registered the disputed domain name on April 22, 2026.¹ The disputed domain name does not lead to an active website, but rather returns the error "DNS_PROBE_FINISHED_NXDOMAIN" or "ERR_NAME_NOT_RESOLVED". The Panel's search of the DNS records for the disputed domain name indicates that the primary DNS servers / name servers do not return DNS records for the disputed domain name, and thus no web IP address is associated with the disputed domain name and web browsers are not directed to a web server or web page when the disputed domain name is entered in a browser.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's CORNING trademarks because the disputed domain name incorporates the CORNING mark in its entirety, and the addition of the descriptive term "-login" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".live" do not dispel confusion. Complainant further asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, has never used or demonstrated preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and "an unauthorized party cannot claim a legitimate interest in a domain name that contains, or is confusing with, a complainant's mark, as the activities of such a party cannot be said to constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services". Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Complainant asserts that Respondent is engaging in bad faith under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, in that the disputed domain name, if ever put to use as a website, would result in consumer confusion. Complainant further notes that – given the composition of the disputed domain

¹ One paragraph of the Complaint states that the disputed domain name was registered on October 8, 2025, while another paragraph of the Complaint states that the disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2026. The Whois information in the Annexes to the Complaint, as well as the Panel's independent Whois search, confirm that the disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2026.

name – Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant's CORNING trademarks, and at a minimum Respondent had constructive notice of Complainant's CORNING trademarks.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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 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.

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 CORNING 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 "-login", 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.

Further, a gTLD "is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

"Any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence presented, shall demonstrate [Respondent's] rights or legitimate interests to the domain name for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii):

(i) before any notice to [Respondent] of the dispute, [Respondent's] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) [has] been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [Respondent has] acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) [Respondent is] making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue." Policy, paragraph 4(c).

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 Respondent has used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

“[W]here a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner.” [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Given Complainant’s long use and registration of the CORNING marks, and the fact that the disputed domain name implies that it has something to do with logging in to a Corning account of some sort, and given Respondent’s failure to file a response and assert any rights or legitimate interests despite these facts, 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. Specifically, “the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that [Respondent has] registered or [Respondent has] acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [Respondent’s] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) [Respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [Respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) [Respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, [Respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [Respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [Respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [Respondent’s] website or location”. Policy, paragraph 4(b).

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 that Complainant has been using the CORNING mark for approximately 150 years, and has many registered trademarks covering its CORNING goods and services. Complainant developed the glass encasement for Thomas Edison's lightbulb, and developed Gorilla Glass which is used on many mobile phones today. Panels have found that "the CORNING trademark is famous". *Corning Incorporated v. Aidan Toner-Rodgers*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0410](#); *see also Corning Incorporated v. lost boy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0407](#) ("The CORNING trademarks enjoy widespread recognition, have generated significant goodwill, and have become famous."). Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the CORNING trademark in combination with the word "login" – suggesting that the disputed domain name could be used to login to some sort of Corning account (and then possibly be used for phishing).

Panels also have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. "[F]actors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put." Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of Complainant's CORNING trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the fact that Respondent did not submit a response, and the potential for the disputed domain name to confuse users into revealing sensitive login credentials. Thus, in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name is indicative of bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 <corning-login.live> be transferred to Complainant.

/Bradley A. Slutsky/
Bradley A. Slutsky
Sole Panelist
Date: June 24, 2026