

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corning Incorporated v. Zhang Yang (张阳)
Case No. DCC2026-0009

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Zhang Yang (张阳), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corning.cc> is registered with eName Technology Co., Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 16, 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 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 21, 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 amended Complaint in English on April 21, 2026.

On April 21, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On April 21, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on April 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a publicly traded company founded in the United States over 165 years ago, carrying on business as a manufacturer of a wide range of innovative goods under the trade mark CORNING (the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the Trade Mark, including United States registration No. 618649, with a registration date of January 3, 1956; and Chinese registration No. 576489, with a registration date of December 20, 1991.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is an individual located in China.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name <corning.cc> was registered on March 17, 2026.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was previously resolved to a website offering the disputed domain name for sale for "200,000 yuan" and containing a number of WeChat QR Codes with direct links to a number of third party websites, including those offering products directly competing with those offered by the Complainant under the Trade Mark (the "Website").

The disputed domain name has also been offered for sale via GoDaddy for approximately USD 64,103, including via a direct banner link from the publicly available Whois search results for the disputed domain name.

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name is no longer resolved to an active website.

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 that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith in connection with the Website and, in particular, to offer it for sale to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant for prices far in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs incurred in registering the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name is in the English language.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions \("WIPO Overview 3.1"\)](#), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 a trade mark or service 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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [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 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 finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under both paragraph 4(b)(i) and paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

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 <corning.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: June 5, 2026