

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. Peter Godstime, VEEAM
Case No. D2026-1992

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Peter Godstime, VEEAM, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hire-corning.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (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 8, 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 May 12, 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 May 14, 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 May 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 15, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on June 17, 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 active in materials science, with a corporate history spanning more than 165 years. The Complainant is the owner of the trademark CORNING (the "Mark"), which it has used in connection with its business since at least 1956. The Complainant is internationally known for its expertise in glass science, ceramic science, and optical physics.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the Mark in jurisdictions worldwide, including the United States. The Complainant is the owner of, among others, United States Trademark Registration Nos. 618649 (registered January 3, 1956), 918421 (registered August 17, 1971), 1682729 (registered April 14, 1992), and 1748228 (registered January 26, 1993).

The Complainant operates its website at "www.corning.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on May 2, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage stating "hire-corning.com" and stating "We're under construction. Please check back for an update soon". (Annex 5 to the Complaint).

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark because it incorporates the Mark in its entirety, and that the addition of the term "hire" does not avoid confusion but heightens it by suggesting that the disputed domain name relates to employment opportunities with the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not authorized to use the Mark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, that the inactive status of the associated webpage does not preclude a finding of bad faith, and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements:

(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.

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 the 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. A domain name that incorporates the entirety of a mark is normally considered confusingly similar to that mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the term "hire" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements but 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 applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), here ".com", is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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.

The Mark is distinctive and has been used and registered for many decades. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Mark in its entirety together with the term “hire”, long after the Complainant established its rights in the Mark. In these circumstances, and given the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of, and with the intention of targeting, the Complainant and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, when considering the totality of the 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. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent’s failure to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use. In the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <hire-corning.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2026