	Case 2:16-cv-05505 Document 8 Filed 07/	22/16 Page 1 of 4 Page ID #:994
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COZEN O'CONNOR 999 Third Avenue, Suite 1900 Seattle, WA 98104 Telephone: 206.340.1000 Facsimile: 206.621.8783 Email: pzecchini@cozen.com amckown@cozen.com Attorneys for Plaintiff PURY GLEN LLC	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12		
13	RUBY GLEN, LLC	Case No.:
14	Plaintiff,	
15	riamuri,	DECLARATION OF JONATHON
16	VS.	NEVETT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S <i>EX PARTE</i>
17	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR	APPLICATION FOR
18 19	ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS AND DOES 1-10	TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
20	Defendant	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		1

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

10

- 11
- 12 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22 23
- 24
- 25
- 26 27
- 28

DECLARATION OF JONATHON NEVETT

I, Jonathon Nevett, hereby declare as follows:

- I am the co-founder and Executive Vice President for Corporate Affairs of Donuts Inc., an affiliate of Ruby Glen, LLC ("Ruby Glen"). I coordinated Ruby Glen's application for the .WEB generic Top-level Domain ("gTLD"). The matters referred to in this declaration are based upon my personal knowledge, and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently thereto.
- 2. In or about 2011, ICANN approved the expansion of a number of the gTLDs available to eligible applicants as part of its 2012 Generic Top Level Domains Internet Expansion Program. In January 2012, ICANN invited eligible domain name registries to submit applications to obtain the rights to operate various new gTLDs, including .WEB and .WEBS.
- 3. In May, 2012, Ruby Glen submitted application number 1-1527-54849 for the .WEB contention set. Ruby Glen also paid ICANN the required \$185,000 participation fee.
- ICANN encourages applicants to settle string contention amongst 4. themselves. If the applicants are able to do so, then ICANN receives only the \$185,000 participation fee from each bidder in a given contention set. If a private resolution cannot be reached, ICANN will hold what is called "an auction of last resort." Unlike the private resolution of the contention set, ICANN not only receives the application fee from each applicant, but it also receives 100% of the proceeds from the auction.
- On June 1, 2016, I learned that Nu Dotco, LLC ("NDC") was the only 5. member of the .WEB contention set unwilling to agree to participate in resolving the contention set by way of a private resolution. Of the 9 previous New gTLD Program resolutions that NDC has participated in, this was the first auction in which NDC pushed for an auction of last resort. As far as I am aware, NDC was the only .WEB contention set member that refused to resolve the process privately.

correspondence with Mr. Rasco on June 7, 2016 is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

ICANN's recent meeting in Helsinki, Finland. On July 10, 2016, I submitted

correspondence to the ICANN Ombudsman in which I provided further information

(and the other applicants) time to investigate and address the contradictory

representations made by NDC in relation to its pending application and status as an

auction participant at every opportunity in order to achieve an appropriate level of

On June 7, 2016, I contacted Jose Rasco, a manager of NDC, to inquire as

On June 22, 2016, I contacted ICANN staff in writing regarding apparent

I raised the need for a postponement of the .WEB auction to allow ICANN

1 to whether NDC might reconsider its decision to forego resolution of the .WEB 2 contention set prior to ICANN's auction of last resort. In response, Mr. Rasco advised 3 that Nicolai Bezsonoff, who is identified on NDC's .WEB application as Secondary 4 5 Contact, Manager, and COO, was no longer involved with NDC's applications. Mr. Rasco also stated that their board included several new members and indicated a 6 7 potential change in NDC's ownership. A true and correct copy of my email

6.

7.

8.

related to the statements made by NDC.

transparency as to who we were competing with for .WEB.

9 discrepancies between NDC's application and the information provided by to me by 10 Mr. Rasco. I also formally raised the issue with the ICANN Ombudsman on or about 11 12 June 30, 2016, and discussed the matter with ICANN staff and the Ombudsman at

8

- 13 14
- 15
- 16 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21

///

///

///

///

///

- 22
- /// 23
- 24 25
- 26 ///
- 27
- 28