

# EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 16-00862 RGK (JCx)	Date	March 4, 2016
Title	<i>DOTCONNECTAFRICA TRUST v. INTERNET CORP. FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS</i>		

Present: The Honorable	R. GARY KLAUSNER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
Sharon L. Williams (not present)	Not Reported	N/A	
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.	
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:		
Not Present	Not Present		
<b>Proceedings:</b>	<b>(IN CHAMBERS) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application for TRO (DE 20)</b>		

On March 2, 2016, DotConnectAfrica Trust (“Plaintiff”) filed this Ex Parte Application for TRO. By way of this application, Plaintiff seeks an order enjoining Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“Defendant” or “ICANN”) from issuing the .Africa gTLD until the Court decides Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction, scheduled for hearing on April 4, 2016.

A district court may issue a TRO where the moving party demonstrates the need for immediate relief, and establishes that relief is warranted under one of the following circumstances. Under the traditional criteria, a plaintiff must demonstrate “(1) a strong likelihood of success on the merits, (2) the possibility of irreparable injury to plaintiff if preliminary relief is not granted, (3) a balance of hardships favoring the plaintiff, and (4) advancement of the public interest (in certain cases).” *Guzman v. Shewry*, 552 F.3d 941, 948 (9th Cir. 2009). Alternatively, “a court may grant the injunction if the plaintiff demonstrates “serious questions going to the merits” and a “balance of hardships that tip sharply toward” plaintiff, provided “plaintiff also show that there is a likelihood of irreparable injury and that the injunction is in the public interest.” *Alliance for Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, (632 F.3d 1127, 1131-1132 (9th Cir. 2011).

Upon review of the parties’ arguments, the Court finds serious questions going to the merits. Plaintiff has demonstrated that once the tGLD is issued, it will be unable to obtain those rights elsewhere. Moreover, the injury it will suffer cannot be compensated through monetary damages. In opposition, Defendant states in conclusory fashion only that the African governments and the ICANN community will suffer prejudice if the delegation of the gTLD is delayed.

Based on the foregoing, the Court **grants** Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application for TRO. Defendant is enjoined from issuing the .Africa tGLD until the Court decides Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, scheduled for hearing on April 4, 2016.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
: \_\_\_\_\_  
Initials of Preparer \_\_\_\_\_

# EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. **16-CV-00862 RGK (JCx)** Date April 12, 2016

Title *DotConnectAfrica Trust v. Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers & ZA Central Registry*

Present: The Honorable R. GARY KLAUSNER, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Sharon L. Williams (Not Present)	Not Reported	N/A
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:  
Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:  
Not Present

**Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) Order re: Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction (DE 16)**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

On February 26, 2016, Plaintiff DotConnectAfrica Trust (“DCA”) filed a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) against Defendants Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”), and ZA Central Registry (“ZACR”) (collectively “Defendants”) alleging the following claims: (1) Breach of Contract; (2) Intentional Misrepresentation; (3) Negligent Misrepresentation; (4) Fraud & Conspiracy to Commit Fraud; (5) Unfair Competition (Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code. § 17200); (6) Negligence; (7) Intentional Interference with Contract; (8) Confirmation of IRP Award; (9) Declaratory Relief (that ICANN follow the IRP Declaration and allow the DCA application to proceed through the delegation phase of the process); (10) Declaratory Relief (that the registry agreement between ZACR and ICANN is null and void and that ZACR’s application does not meet ICANN standards); and (11) Declaratory Relief (that the covenant not to sue is unenforceable, unconscionable, procured by fraud and/or void as a matter of law and public policy).

Presently before the Court is DCA’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction. For the following reasons, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion.

**II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

The following facts are alleged in the Complaint.

Defendant ICANN is the sole organization worldwide that assigns rights to Generic Top-level

Domains (“gTLDs”). In 2011, ICANN approved the expansion of the number of gTLDs available to eligible applicants as part of its 2012 Generic Top-Level Domains Internet Expansion Program (“New gTLD Program”). Examples of gTLDs include .Lat, .Wales, .Africa, and .Swiss. ICANN invited eligible parties to submit applications to obtain the rights to these various gTLDs. ICANN promised to conduct the bid process in a transparent manner, ensure competition, and abide by its own bylaws and the rules set forth in the gTLD Applicant’s Guidebook. In March 2012, Plaintiff DCA submitted an application to ICANN to obtain the rights to the .Africa gTLD. DCA paid ICANN the mandatory application fee of \$185,000. On February 17, 2014, Defendant ZACR also submitted an application for .Africa.

#### **A. Geographic Name Applications and the Governmental Advisory Committee**

ICANN’s Applicant Guidebook contains an overview of the application process. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 3 at 1-3–1-14, ECF No. 17.) After the administrative completeness check, ICANN conducts an initial evaluation of the application. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 3 at 1-7, ECF No. 17.) During the initial evaluation, ICANN conducts string reviews, which determine whether a gTLD is too similar to existing TLDs. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 3 at 1-7, ECF No. 17.) The initial evaluation also includes the geographic name evaluation, in which ICANN determines whether an application contains sufficient endorsements, along with determining whether an applicant has the requisite technical, operational, and financial capabilities to operate a gTLD. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 3 at 1-7, ECF No. 17.) Applicants can request an extended evaluation if it fails the initial evaluation. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 3 at 1-11, ECF No. 17.) Applicants who have successfully completed the initial evaluation (and the extended evaluation, if requested) proceed to the delegation stage, which includes executing a registry agreement with ICANN and conducting a pre-delegation technical test to validate information in the application. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 3 at 1-14, ECF No. 17.)

According to ICANN’s policy and procedures, applicants for geographic gTLDs must obtain endorsements from 60% of the national governments in the region and no more than one written objection from the relevant governments or public authorities associated with the region. DCA obtained endorsements of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (“UNECA”) in August 2008 and the African Union Commission (“AUC”) in August 2009. In 2010, however, AUC sent a letter informing DCA that it has “reconsidered its approach” and “no longer endorses individual initiatives in this matter related to continental resource.” (FAC ¶ 24, ECF No. 10.) The Guidebook states that a government may withdraw its endorsement only if the conditions of its endorsement have not been satisfied. Contrary to ICANN’s allegations, DCA maintains that the AUC letter did not formally withdraw its endorsement of DCA because AUC did not have conditions on its endorsement.

On behalf of ICANN, InterConnect Communications (“ICC”) performs string similarity and geographic review during the initial evaluation stage of the gTLD application process. ICC explained to ICANN that if the endorsements of regional organizations like AUC and UNECA were not applied toward the 60% requirement, neither DCA nor Defendant ZACR would have sufficient geographic support. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 19 & 23, ECF No. 17.) ICANN decided to accept endorsements from both AUC and UNECA. During its initial evaluation, the ICC was required to inform applicants of any problems with their endorsements. The ICC failed to inform DCA of any such problems. Therefore DCA assumed that its endorsements from AUC and UNECA were sufficient.

In 2011, AUC itself, attempted to obtain the rights to .Africa by requesting ICANN to include .Africa in the list of Top-Level Reserved Names, which would have made .Africa unavailable for delegation under the New gTLD Program. In a March 8, 2012 letter, the ICANN Board Chairman Stephen Crocker explained to AUC that ICANN could not reserve .Africa for AUC’s use. However, Crocker explained, AUC could “play a prominent role in determining the outcome of any application” for .Africa as a public authority associated with the continent by (1) filing one written statement of objection, (2) filing a community objection, or (3) utilizing the Governmental Advisory Committee

(“GAC”) to combat a competing application. (FAC ¶ 69, ECF No. 10.) The Governmental Advisory Committee (“GAC”) is an internal committee that considers applicants and provides advice related to governmental concerns. Under ICANN’s rules, the GAC can recommend that ICANN cease reviewing an application if all of the GAC members agree that an application should not proceed because an applicant is sensitive or problematic. Membership on the GAC is open to representatives of all national governments. AUC became a GAC member in June 2012, apparently on the advice of ICANN.

Because AUC could not obtain .Africa directly through ICANN, AUC contracted with ZACR in March 2014. In exchange for AUC’s endorsement, ZACR would assign to AUC all rights relating to .Africa upon its delegation to ZACR. Subsequently, because of AUC’s interest in ZACR’s application for .Africa, AUC used its influence as a GAC member to campaign against DCA’s application. In June 2013, ICANN accepted the GAC’s advice and rejected DCA’s application for lacking the requisite endorsements. This decision was made amid DCA’s objection that several members of the GAC had conflicts of interest and that Kenya was unrepresented at the GAC meeting. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 24 & 25, ECF. No. 17.) Contrary to ICANN’s contentions, DCA maintains that the lack of unanimous support within the GAC rendered the decision to suspend DCA’s application improper.

DCA further argues that, if ICANN applied the GAC’s rationale for rejecting DCA’s application equally to ZACR, ZACR’s application should have failed as well. Specifically, applying the same standards, ZACR did not have sufficient country specific endorsements to meet ICANN’s requirements: (1) only five of the purported endorsement letters from specific African governments referenced ZACR by name; and (2) ZACR filed support letters in which African governments generally endorsed AUC’s “Reserved Names” initiative without specifically referencing ZACR. ZACR presumably passed the 60% threshold requirement based on the same regional endorsements that the GAC used to derail DCA’s application. Nonetheless, ZACR passed the initial evaluation and entered into the delegation phase with ICANN.

## **B. The Independent Review Process**

As a means to challenge ICANN’s actions with respect to gTLD applications, ICANN provides applicants with an independent review process (“IRP”). The IRP is arbitration comprised of an independent panel of arbitrators. In October 2013, DCA sought an IRP to review ICANN’s processing of its application, including ICANN’s handling of the GAC opinion. In its decision, the IRP Panel found against ICANN as follows: (1) ICANN’s actions and inactions with respect to DCA’s application were inconsistent with ICANN’s bylaws and articles of incorporation; and (2) ICANN should refrain from delegating .Africa and permit DCA’s application to proceed through the remainder of the evaluation process.

DCA asserts that ICANN did not act in accordance with the decision, which was binding. Instead of allowing DCA’s application to proceed through the remainder of the application process (i.e. the delegation phase), ICANN restarted DCA’s application from the beginning and re-reviewed its endorsements. In September 2015, during the second review, ICANN issued clarifying questions regarding DCA’s endorsements, which it did not raise during the initial evaluation of these same endorsements. The DCA requested an extended evaluation, hoping to gain insight on what was wrong with its application. Rather than providing clarification, ICANN merely restated the same questions – allegedly as a pretext to deny DCA’s application – then denied DCA’s application in February 2016. Soon thereafter, ICANN began the process of delegating .Africa to ZACR.

On March 4, 2016, this Court issued a Temporary Restraining Order to prevent ICANN from delegating .Africa to ZACR until the Court decided this present Motion.

## **III. JUDICIAL STANDARD**

“[I]njunctive relief [is] an extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief.” *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008). For a court to grant a preliminary injunction, a plaintiff must establish the following: (1) likelihood of success on the merits, (2) likelihood of irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, (3) that the balance of equities tips in its favor, and (4) that the public interest favors injunction. *Id.* at 20.

The Ninth Circuit also employs a “sliding scale” approach to preliminary injunctions. *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2011). This approach uses the same four factors as the *Winter* test, but allows the plaintiff to receive a preliminary injunction in situations where there are “serious questions” going toward the plaintiff’s likelihood of success on the merits, so long as the “balance of hardships tips sharply in the plaintiff’s favor.” *Id.* at 1134-35. The plaintiff must still demonstrate a likelihood of irreparable harm and that public interest favors the injunction. *Id.* at 1135.

## VI. DISCUSSION

DCA seeks a preliminary injunction barring ICANN from issuing the rights to .Africa until this case is resolved. DCA moves for a preliminary injunction based on its Ninth Claim for Declaratory Relief. DCA’s Ninth Claim seeks a judicial declaration that ICANN follow the IRP decision and allow the DCA application to proceed through the delegation phase of the application process. In determining whether relief should be granted, the Court addresses each of the relevant factors for preliminary injunction.

### A. Likelihood of Success on the Merits

#### 1. *The Release Does Not Bar DCA’s Claim at This Time.*

As a preliminary matter, ICANN argues that DCA, by submitting a New gTLD Program application, is bound by the terms in the Applicant Guidebook. These terms include a Release barring applicants from challenging in court any decision made by ICANN. (Bekele Decl. 6-4, Ex. 3, ECF No. 17.) DCA argues, however, that the Release is unenforceable because it violates California Civil Code § 1668, is unconscionable, and was procured by fraud. The Court finds substantial questions as to the Release, weighing toward its unenforceability.

California Civil Code § 1668 finds that “[a]ll contracts which have for their object, directly or indirectly, to exempt anyone from responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property or another, or violation of law, whether willful or negligent, are against the policy of the law.”

The Release applies to all gTLD applicants and states, in relevant part:

Applicant hereby releases ICANN . . . from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN . . . in connection with ICANN’s . . . review of this application. . . . Applicant agrees not to challenge . . . and irrevocably waives any right to sue or proceed in court.

(Bekele Decl. 6-4, Ex. 3, ECF No. 17.) On its face, the Release is “against the policy of the law” because it exempts ICANN from *any and all claims* arising out of the application process, even those arising from fraudulent or willful conduct. Cal. Civ. Code § 1668.

ICANN argues that Section 1668 is limited only to agreements involving the public interest,



which the Guidebook is not, and cites to *Tunkl v. Regents of Cal.*, 383 P.2d 441 (Cal. 1963) for support. However, *Tunkl* concerns the validity of a release from liability for negligence, not intentional acts or fraud. Here, the Release waives all liability, not just liability resulting from negligence. Thus, *Tunkl* is distinguishable, and the Court need not determine whether the Release is in an agreement involving the public interest.

ICANN further argues that, if the Release is found to violate Section 1668, the Court should limit its unenforceability to DCA's claims sounding in fraud. ICANN contends that because the request for preliminary injunction is based solely on DCA's Declaratory Relief Claim, which does not sound in fraud, the Release is enforceable as it pertains to this Claim. (Def.'s Opp'n to Mot. for Prelim. Inj. 15:12-14, ECF No. 35.) The Court disagrees. ICANN fails to recognize that the alleged conduct giving rise to this claim is intentional. Specifically, DCA alleges that ICANN intended to deny DCA's application after the IRP proceeding under any pretext and without a legitimate reason. (FAC ¶ 59, ECF No. 10.) DCA claims that "the process ICANN put Plaintiff through was a sham with a predetermined ending – ICANN's denial of Plaintiff's application so that ICANN could steer the gTLD to ZACR." (FAC ¶ 60, ECF No. 10.)

In support, DCA offers the following evidence. ICANN's initial evaluation report in July 2013 stated that DCA's endorsement letters "met all relevant criteria in Section 2.2.1.4.3 of the Applicant Guidebook." (Bekele Decl. ¶ 40, Ex. 27, ECF No. 17.) After the IRP Decision, ICANN performed a second evaluation on the same information originally submitted by DCA. In the second evaluation, however, ICANN found that the endorsement letters did not meet the same criteria applied in the first evaluation, and sent DCA clarifying questions regarding its endorsements. (Bekele Decl. ¶ 24, Ex. 15, ECF No. 17.) The clarifying questions required DCA to submit endorsement letters that "[d]emonstrate[d] the government's or public authority's understanding that the string is being sought through the gTLD application process and that the applicant is willing to accept the conditions under which the string will be available." (Bekele Decl. ¶ 24, Ex. 15, ECF No. 17.) The discrepancy between the pre-IRP and post-IRP evaluations led DCA to seek further clarification, specifically regarding the standard imposed on the endorsement letters at issue. However, in response, ICANN merely sent the same questions. (Bekele Decl. ¶ 26, Ex. 17, ECF No. 17.) DCA then submitted to an extended evaluation, which allows further review and is available to applicants who failed the initial evaluation. Without further communication, ICANN then issued a final decision that restated that the endorsement letters "did not meet the criteria described in Section 2.2.1.4.3 of the Applicant Guidebook." (Bekele Decl. ¶ 28, Ex. 18, ECF No. 17.) ICANN's conduct thereby rendered DCA's application ineligible for further review. (Bekele Decl. ¶ 28, Ex. 18, ECF No. 17.)

The evidence suggests that ICANN intended to deny DCA's application based on pretext. Defendants have not introduced any controverting facts. As such, the Court finds serious questions regarding the enforceability of the Release due to California Civil Code § 1668.

Because the Court finds serious questions regarding the enforceability of the Release due to California Civil Code § 1668, the Court need not address DCA's arguments regarding unconscionability or procurement by fraud.

## 2. *There Are Serious Questions as to the Merits of DCA's Ninth Claim.*

After its review, the IRP Panel declared: (1) "both the actions and inactions of the Board with respect to the application of DCA [] relating to the .AFRICA gTLD were inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of ICANN" and (2) ICANN "continue to refrain from delegating the .AFRICA gTLD and permit [DCA's] application to proceed through the remainder of the [New gTLD Program] application process." (Bekele Decl., Ex. 1 ¶ 61, ECF No. 17.) DCA alleges in its Ninth Claim that ICANN failed to follow the IRP Panel's binding order, resulting in ICANN's not properly

considering DCA's application.

After the IRP Decision, ICANN placed DCA at the geographic name evaluation stage of the application process and thereafter determined that DCA lacked the requisite support. (Bekele Decl. ¶ 28, Ex. 18, ECF No. 17.) DCA contends that ICANN violated the IRP Decision by restarting the geographic name evaluation, which it had already passed, rather than permitting the application to resume at the delegation phase. (Pl.'s Mot. for Prelim. Inj. 13:4-5, ECF No.16.) ICANN, however, argues that at the time DCA's application had been initially rejected, the application was still under review at the geographic name evaluation stage, and the evaluation was not yet complete. (Def.'s Opp'n to Mot. for Prelim. Inj. 17:20-22, ECF No. 35.) Accordingly, ICANN maintains that it placed DCA's application at the proper stage of evaluation after the IRP Decision.

Despite ICANN's contention, the evidence presents serious questions pointing in favor of DCA's argument. First, a March 2013 email from ICC to ICANN stated that ICANN needs to clarify AUC's endorsements since AUC properly endorsed both DCA and ZACR. (Bekele Decl. ¶ 30, Ex. 19, ECF No. 17.) Subsequently, ICANN's July 2013 initial evaluation report found that the endorsement letters have "met all relevant criteria in Section 2.2.1.4.3 of the Applicant Guidebook." (Bekele Decl. ¶ 40, Ex. 27, ECF No. 17.) Because ICANN found DCA's application passed the geographic names evaluation in the July 2013 initial evaluation report, the Court finds serious questions in DCA's favor as to whether DCA's application should have proceeded to the delegation stage following the IRP Decision.

ICANN further argues that even if ICANN failed to follow the IRP Decision, the Decision was only advisory, and not binding. The evidence does not provide clear indications on this point. On the one hand, the Panel concluded "that its [Decision] on the IRP and its future [Decision] on the Merits of the case were binding on the Parties." (Bekele Decl., Ex. 1 ¶ 23, ECF No. 17.) The Panel explains, "[v]arious provisions of ICANN's Bylaws and the Supplementary Procedures support the conclusion that the Panel's decisions, opinions and declarations are binding . . . [t]he selection of the [International Dispute Resolution Procedures] as the baseline set of procedures for IRP's, therefore, points to a binding adjudicative process." (Bekele Decl., Ex. 1 ¶ 23, ECF No. 17.) The Panel opined that if the decision is not binding, then at a minimum, "the IRP should forthrightly explain and acknowledge that the process is merely advisory." (Bekele Decl., Ex. 1 ¶ 23, ECF No. 17.) The IRP did not provide such explanation or acknowledgment. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 1 ¶ 23, ECF No. 17.) On the other hand, language in the IRP Decision states that the Panel "*recommends* that ICANN continue to refrain from delegating the .Africa gTLD and permit [DCA's] application to proceed through the remainder of the new gTLD application process." (Bekele Decl., Ex. 1 ¶ 149, ECF No. 17 (emphasis added).) It is clear the decision that ICANN violated its bylaws by failing to fairly review DCA's application is binding. However, it is *not* clear whether ICANN was mandated to permit DCA's application to proceed through the remainder of the process. Without extrinsic evidence as a guide, logic dictates that if the "recommendation" is, in fact, non-binding, the Panel's decision that ICANN violated its bylaws (which is undisputedly binding) is rendered ineffectual. Because the IRP is presumably in place to effect dispute resolution, and the IRP provided no explanation or acknowledgment that its decision was merely advisory, the Court finds serious questions on this issue.

For the reasons stated above, the Court finds serious questions going toward the merits of DCA's Ninth Claim.

**B. Likelihood of Irreparable Harm**

As DCA points out, without preliminary relief, DCA will lose the opportunity to fairly have its application reviewed by ICANN. If DCA loses this opportunity, DCA will suffer irreparable harm because .Africa can be delegated only once, and only by ICANN. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 3 Application Terms and Conditions ¶ 3, ECF No. 17.) Further, only one entity can operate .Africa. (Bekele Decl., Ex. 3 at 4-2, ECF No. 17.) DCA has sufficiently demonstrated that, due to the unique nature of .Africa, it will likely suffer irreparable harm without preliminary relief.

Moreover, on March 4, 2016, the Court issued a temporary restraining order precluding ICANN from delegating the rights to .Africa until the Court rules on the present motion. (Order Granting TRO, ECF No. 27.) In that Order, the Court found that without a TRO, ICANN would have immediately delegated the rights to .Africa. (Order Granting TRO, ECF No. 27.) The Court finds no evidence indicating a change in circumstances. It is reasonable to believe that without a preliminary injunction, ICANN will immediately delegate the rights to .Africa to ZACR, causing DCA to suffer irreparable harm.

ICANN argues only that DCA cannot possibly suffer irreparable harm because it seeks compensatory relief. This argument is unavailing. Seeking compensatory damages does not preclude the Court from finding irreparable harm, as the control over .Africa cannot fully be compensated by money. *See Blackwater Lodge & Training Ctr., Inc. v. Broughton*, 2008 U.S. Dist. Lexis 49371 at \*28 (S.D. Cal. 2008) (granting preliminary injunction despite plaintiff seeking monetary relief).

The Court thus finds that without relief, DCA will likely suffer irreparable harm.

**C. Balance of Equities**

The balance of equities tips in favor of granting the preliminary injunction. Without a preliminary injunction, DCA will lose the opportunity to obtain rights to .Africa because ICANN will likely delegate the rights to ZACR prior to the conclusion of this action, and these rights can be delegated only once. DCA has invested much time and money in the application process under the representation that the process would be unbiased and fair. Although DCA may be able to recover certain funds through litigation, such as the application fee, the opportunity to obtain the rights to .Africa would be forever gone. ICANN's position, however, will be no different if it delays delegating the rights to .Africa. Thus, the balance of equities tips sharply in DCA's favor.

**D. The Public Interest Favors Granting Preliminary Injunction**

The public interest favors granting a preliminary injunction. "The public interest analysis for the issuance of a preliminary injunction requires us to consider whether there exists some critical public interest that would be injured by the grant of preliminary relief." *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1138 (9th Cir. 2011). Here, the public has an interest in the fair and transparent application process that grants gTLD rights. ICANN regulates the internet – a global system that dramatically impacts daily life in today's society. The IRP Declaration recognizes that ICANN's function is "special, unique, and publicly important" and ICANN itself "is the steward of a highly valuable and important international resources." (Bekele Decl. ¶ 23.110, Ex. 1, ECF No. 17.)

ICANN argues that a delay in delegating .Africa will prejudice the African community's efforts to participate in the Internet economy and strengthen their technology sectors. (Def.'s Opp'n to Mot. for Prelim. Inj. 20:3-5, ECF No. 35.) The evidence supporting ICANN's argument is a declaration of Moctar Yedaly, the head of the Information Society Division of the AUC's Infrastructure and Energy Department. (Yedaly Decl. ¶ 11, ECF No. 40.) The AUC's relationship with ZACR, and its interest in

preventing the delay of issuing rights to .Africa creates a conflict of interest. Therefore, on this point, the Court accords little weight to the Yedaly Declaration. On balance, the Court finds it more prejudicial to the African community, and the international community in general, if the delegation of .Africa is made prior to a determination on the fairness of the process by which it was delegated.

For the reasons stated, the Court finds the public interest favors granting the preliminary injunction.

**E. Implementing the “Sliding Scale” Approach**

Implementing the Ninth Circuit’s “sliding scale” approach to preliminary injunctions, the Court finds “serious questions” going toward DCA’s likelihood of success on the merits and a balance of hardships that tips sharply in DCA’s favor. *Alliance for the Wild Rockies* at 1131. Additionally, the Court finds that both the likelihood of irreparable injury and the public interest favors the injunction. As such, the Court **GRANTS** a preliminary injunction barring ICANN from delegating the rights to .Africa until this case is resolved.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
: \_\_\_\_\_  
**Initials of Preparer** \_\_\_\_\_

# EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. **16-CV-00862 RGK (JCx)** Date June 20, 2016

Title ***DotConnectAfrica Trust v. Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers & ZA Central Registry***

Present: The Honorable R. GARY KLAUSNER, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Sharon L. Williams (Not Present) Deputy Clerk	Not Reported Court Reporter / Recorder	N/A Tape No.
--	---	-----------------

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present

**Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) Order re: Defendants Motion for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Preliminary Injunction (DEs 85 and 86)**

**I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

On February 26, 2016, Plaintiff DotConnectAfrica Trust (“Plaintiff”) filed a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) against Defendants Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”), and ZA Central Registry (“ZACR”) (collectively “Defendants”). The action arises out of a dispute involving the delegation of rights related to the .Africa top-level domain.

On March 4, 2016, the Court granted Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application for TRO, enjoining ICANN from issuing the .Africa top-level domain until the Court decided Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction. On April 12, 2016, the Court granted Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction, keeping the injunction in place until resolution of the action.

On April 26, 2016, ZACR filed a Motion to Dismiss all claims asserted against it. On May 6, 2016, ZACR filed the current Motion for Reconsideration regarding the Court’s Order re Preliminary Injunction. ICANN joined this motion on May 10, 2016. Since then, the Court has granted ZACR’s Motion to Dismiss in its entirety, thereby extinguishing ZACR’s role a party to the action. Therefore, the Court **denies as moot** ZACR’s motion for reconsideration, and addresses the motion only as it pertains to ICANN.

Upon review ICANN’s arguments, the Court **denies** ICANN’s motion.

## **II. JUDICIAL STANDARD**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) governs a motion to reconsider a preliminary injunction, and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) governs a motion to vacate or dissolve a preliminary injunction. *Credit Suisse First Boston Corp. v. Grunwald*, 400 F.3d 1119, 1124 (9th Cir. 2005). While a motion made under Rule 59(e) seeks to relitigate the issues underlying the original preliminary injunction, a motion made under Rule 54(b) seeks relief from inequities that arise after the original order. *Id.* Therefore, a Rule 54(b) motion requires new or changed circumstances that have arisen after the court granted the injunction. *Id.* Here, ICANN does not raise any new or changed circumstances that have arisen after the Court's April 12, 2016 Order re Preliminary Injunction. Therefore, the standards of Rule 59(e) and its corresponding Local Rule 7-18 apply.

Relief under Rule 59(e) is appropriate if the court "(1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." *Dixon v. Wallowa Cty.*, 336 F.3d 1013, 1022 (9th Cir. 2003) (internal citation omitted). Additionally Local Rule 7-18 states that a motion for reconsideration may be made only on the following grounds:

(a) a material difference in fact or law from that presented to the Court before such decision that in the exercise of reasonable diligence could not have been known to the party moving for reconsideration at the time of such decision, or (b) the emergence of new material facts or a change of law occurring after the time of such decision, or (c) a manifest showing of a failure to consider material facts presented to the Court before such decision. No motion for reconsideration shall in any manner repeat any oral or written argument made in support of or in opposition to the original motion.

## **III. DISCUSSION**

ICANN moves for reconsideration on the following grounds: (1) the Court made an erroneous factual finding that impacts its determination of the merits; and (2) Plaintiff misrepresented facts regarding irreparable injury. ICANN further argues that even if the Court maintains the injunction, it should order Plaintiff to post a bond. For the following reasons, the Court finds ICANN's arguments unavailing.

### **A. Erroneous Finding of Fact**

ICANN argues, and Plaintiff concedes, that the Court made an erroneous finding of fact in its Order re Preliminary Injunction ("Order"). However, based on consideration of the corrected facts, the Court finds its determination of the merits unchanged.

After the IRP conducted its investigation, it issued a declaration stating that ICANN should "permit [Plaintiff's] application to proceed through the remainder of the new gTLD application process." (Eschete Decl. Ex. 1 (IRP Panel Decl. at 62).) In response, ICANN resumed Plaintiff's application at the Geographic Names Panel. A key issue in the parties' dispute is whether ICANN violated the IRP Declaration by not allowing the application to resume at a point after the geographic names evaluation phase.

In its Order, the Court stated, "[b]ecause ICANN found [Plaintiff's] application passed the geographic names evaluation in the July 2013 initial evaluation report, the Court finds serious questions in [Plaintiff's] favor as to whether [Plaintiff's] application should have proceeded to the delegation stage following the IRP decision." (Order at 6.) Both parties agree that Plaintiff, in fact, did not pass the



geographic name evaluation process. Rather, the evidence relied on by the Court shows that ZACR passed the geographic name evaluation. Therefore, the Court erred.

Nonetheless, upon reconsideration of the facts and evidence, there still exists serious questions going to whether Plaintiff had acquired a sufficient number of endorsements to have passed the geographic names evaluation phase in the first instance. In the IRP Declaration, the panel stated that “both the actions and inactions of the Board with respect to the application of [Plaintiff] relating to the .AFRICA gTLD were inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of ICANN.” (IRP Panel Decl. at 61.) At this stage of litigation, it is reasonable to infer that the IRP Panel found that ICANN’s rejection of Plaintiff’s application at the geographic names evaluation phase was improper, and that the application should proceed to the delegation phase.

The Court finds that the error in its factual finding was not determinative to its ultimate conclusion that there are serious questions going toward Plaintiff’s likelihood of success on the merits.

### **B. Irreparable Injury**

ICANN states that the Court found irreparable injury in Plaintiff’s favor by erroneously relying on Plaintiff’s representation that .Africa can be delegated only once. ICANN now argues that a gTLD, including .Africa, *can* be redelegated, and in fact, ICANN’s 2013 manual provides step-by-step instructions on how to perform a redelegation. ICANN’s argument fails.

As an initial matter, ICANN failed to make this argument in its opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction. ICANN does not state that this fact was unknown or unavailable to ICANN prior to the Court’s issuance of the injunction, nor is there reason to believe it can. On this basis alone, ICANN’s argument fails.<sup>1</sup>

Even if the Court considered this argument, however, there is still adequate evidence provided by Plaintiff (i.e., loss of business funding, etc.) to find irreparable injury on the part of Plaintiff. Therefore, the Court’s finding regarding balance of the hardships also remains unchanged.

### **C. Posting of Bond**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) states that a court may issue a preliminary injunction only if the movant gives security in an amount that the court considers proper to pay the costs and damages sustained by any party found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained.

Again, ICANN failed to make any argument or showing of costs or damages in its initial opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction. ICANN cannot use a motion for reconsideration for a second bite at the apple. Moreover, even in its current motion, ICANN does not introduce any costs or damages it will suffer if it is found to have been wrongfully enjoined.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that even if ZACR was still in the action, there is a substantial question as to whether ZACR’s failure to even attempt to submit an opposition places it in the same situation as ICANN. It is undisputed that although ZACR was officially served with the complaint a week after the opposition briefing deadline had already passed, ZACR knew of Plaintiff’s motion well before that time. From the time ZACR had been served to the time the Court issued the injunction, three weeks had elapsed. At no time during this period did ZACR attempt to oppose Plaintiff’s motion.

<sup>2</sup> All evidence of costs and damages were submitted by ZACR. Even if ZACR was still a party to the action, there are substantial questions as to whether ZACR’s stated damages are unavoidable, and whether ZACR’s lost profits are too speculative to form the basis for security.



**IV. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** ICANN's Motion Reconsideration.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_  
**Initials of Preparer** \_\_\_\_\_

# EXHIBIT 4

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

DOTCONNECTAFRICA TRUST,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO.

2:16-cv-00862-RGK (JCx)

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR  
ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS,  
et al.,

Defendants.

~~~~~

DEPOSITION OF  
CHRISTINE WILLETT

October 7, 2016

9:03 a.m.

11766 Wilshire Boulevard  
Suite 1670  
Los Angeles, California

Dawn Schetne, CSR No. 5140

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL

2  
3 For the Plaintiff:

4 BROWN, NERI, SMITH & KAHN LLP  
5 ETHAN J. BROWN, ESQ.  
6 SARA C. COLON, ESQ.  
7 11766 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1670  
8 Los Angeles, California 90025  
310.593.9890  
310.593.9980 Fax  
ethan@bnsklaw.com  
sara@bnsklaw.com

9  
10 For the Defendant:

11 JONES DAY  
12 JEFFREY A. LeVEE, ESQ.  
13 555 South Flower Street, Fiftieth Floor  
14 Los Angeles, California 90071-2300  
213.489.3939  
213.243.2539 Fax  
jlevee@jonesday.com

15 Also Present:

16 Amy Stathos (Appeared Telephonically)  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 Q. Is it your understanding that the DCA  
2 application ultimately failed to pass geographic names  
3 review because of the purported withdraw of support from  
4 the AUC?

5 A. No.

6 Q. What's your basis for that belief?

7 A. Because the AUC's letter was only one letter.  
8 It was only one entity that could have provided support.  
9 My understanding from the panel and other discussions is  
10 that there were other entities who -- potentially UNECA,  
11 but 36 of the 58 countries who could have provided  
12 letters of support, and as long as there was a  
13 sufficient number of them comprising 60 percent, then  
14 that would have qualified DCA.

15 Q. Let me ask it a different way. Is it your  
16 understanding that the ICC panel concluded that the AUC  
17 letter was insufficient because it had been purportedly  
18 withdrawn at some point?

19 MR. LeVEE: The letter from 2008?

20 MR. BROWN: The original letter from 2008, yes.

21 THE WITNESS: No, that's not my understanding.

22 BY MR. BROWN:

23 Q. Do you have a different understanding?

24 A. My understanding is that the letter was deemed  
25 insufficient because of the -- I would want to look at

1 the specific clarifying questions, but based on one or  
2 more of the four criteria that each letter must provide.  
3 My recollection is that DCA provided multiple letters of  
4 support.

5 Q. Let me mark this document as Exhibit 22.

6 (Exhibit 22 was marked.)

7 BY MR. BROWN:

8 Q. Are you familiar with Exhibit 22?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. What is it?

11 A. These are the clarifying questions issued by  
12 the ICC to DCA during extended evaluation.

13 Q. And if you would look at the very first page,  
14 clarifying question No. 5, is that your understanding --  
15 is your understanding that that is the clarifying  
16 question that relates specifically to the endorsement of  
17 the Africa Union Commission?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Based on your review of that letter, can you  
20 explain to me your understanding of the basis upon which  
21 the original endorsement letter that .Africa obtained in  
22 2009 was deemed insufficient?

23 MR. LeVEE: I'll object that the exhibit speaks  
24 for itself, but you can answer the question.

25 THE WITNESS: So as written here, it identifies

1 the four criteria which must be in the letter of  
2 support, and specifically what this clarifying question  
3 is saying is that criteria No. 4 was not met by the  
4 letter as submitted. The 2009 letter. And it's asking  
5 for DCA to provide an updated letter that meets  
6 criteria 4, specifically demonstrating that the  
7 government or public authority's understanding is that  
8 the string is being sought through the new gTLD program  
9 and is willing to accept the conditions under which the  
10 string will be available.

11 BY MR. BROWN:

12 Q. So the letter specifically calls out criteria  
13 No. 4. Is it fair, then, to assume that the original  
14 letter of 2009 was deemed sufficient to meet the first  
15 three criteria?

16 A. Based on this clarifying question, I believe  
17 so.

18 Q. Is there specific language that's required in  
19 the letter in order to meet criteria No. 4?

20 MR. LeVEE: Specific words?

21 MR. BROWN: Yes, magic words that need to be in  
22 the letter.

23 THE WITNESS: That the string is being sought  
24 through the gTLD application process. A whole bunch of  
25 geographic applicants got letters of support that didn't

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION

I, Dawn Schetne, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in  
and for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing witness was by me duly sworn;  
that the deposition was then taken before me at the time  
and place herein set forth; that the testimony and  
proceedings were reported stenographically by me and  
later transcribed into typewriting under my direction;  
that the foregoing is a true record of the testimony and  
proceedings taken at that time.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name this  
17th day of October, 2016.



Dawn Schetne, CSR No. 5140