1 2 3 4 5 6	Ethan J. Brown (SBN 218814) <u>ethan@bnsklaw.com</u> Sara C. Colón (SBN 281514) <u>sara@bnsklaw.com</u> <b>BROWN NERI SMITH &amp; KHAN LLP</b> 11766 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1670 Los Angeles, California 90025 Telephone: (310) 593-9890 Facsimile: (310) 593-9980 Attornaya for Blaintiff			
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff DOTCONNECTAFRICA TRUST			
8	SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9 10	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL			
10	DOTCONNECTAFRICA TRUST, a Mauritius	Case No. BC607494		
12	Charitable Trust; Plaintiff,	Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable Howard L. Halm		
13 14	v.	EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS BY		
15	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR	DOTCONNECTAFRICA TO DECLARATION KEVIN ESPINOLA IN		
16 17	ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, a California corporation;	SUPPORT OF ICANN'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION		
17	Defendants.			
19		DATE: February 2, 2017 TIME: 8:29 a.m. DEPT: 53		
20				
21				
22				
23 24				
24				
26				
27				
28				
	EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO DECLARATION OF KEVIN ESPINOLA IN SUPPORT OF ICANN'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION			

## **Evidentiary Objections to Declaration of Kevin Espinola**

1

2	Kevin Espinola Declaration ¶	DCA Objection	Sustained	Overruled
3 4 5 6 7 8	¶ 2: ICANN and its community developed the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook ("Guidebook") as part of a years-long, bottom-up multistakeholder process during which numerous versions were published by ICANN for public comment and revised, in part based on comments received. In total, six versions of the Guidebook were published for public comment.	<ol> <li>Lacks foundation (Evid. Code § 403.)</li> <li>Lacks personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702)</li> <li>Best Evidence Rule (Evid. Code § 1520.)</li> </ol>		
9	Kevin Espinola Declaration ¶	DCA Objection	Sustained	Overruled
<ol> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ol>	¶ 3: In the April 15, 2011 version of the Guidebook ("April 2011 Guidebook"), language was added to Section 6 of Module 6 of the Guidebook ("Covenant Not to Sue") making explicit that: "[an] applicant may utilize any accountability mechanism set forth in ICANN's Bylaws for [the] purposes of challenging any final decision made by ICANN with respect to the application." Attached hereto as <b>Exhibit K</b> is a true and correct copy of Module 6 of the April 2011 version of the Guidebook, which was published with a redline, showing changes made from the prior version of the Guidebook.	<ol> <li>Lacks foundation (Evid. Code § 403.)</li> <li>Lacks personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702)</li> <li>Improper Opinion Testimony (Evid. Code § 800-803.)</li> <li>Best Evidence Rule (Evid. Code § 1520.)</li> </ol>		
21	Kevin Espinola Declaration ¶	DCA Objection	Sustained	Overruled
22 23	¶ 4: As ICANN has stated publicly, ICANN is a not-for-profit public	1. Lacks foundation (Evid. Code § 403.)		
24	benefit corporation and anticipated that, absent a broad waiver and limitation of liability in the	2. Lacks personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702)		
25 26	Guidebook's terms and conditions, the over 1,900 applicants could initiate frivolous and costly legal actions in an	3. Speculation (Evid. Code § 702.)		
27 28	attempt to challenge legitimate I CANN decisions, which would imperil the successful implementation of the	4. Hearsay (Evid. Code § 1200, et seq.)		

EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO DECLARATION OF KEVIN ESPINOLA IN SUPPORT OF ICANN'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

1		proper Opinion	
2		mony (Evid. Code § 803.)	
3	such challenges, and the Covenant Not to Sue in the Guidebook was deemed		
4	appropriate in light of these		
5	considerations.		
6	Dated: January 26, 2017 Bl	ROWN NERI SMITH & KHAN LLP	
7	By:		
8	Sara C. Colón		
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10		DOTCONNECTAFRICA TRUST	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22 23			
23 24			
24 25			
25 26			
20			
27			
	EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO DECLARATION OF KEVIN ESPINOLA IN SUPPORT OF ICANN'S		
	OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION 2		