MANWIN LICENSING INTERNATIONAL S.A.R.L.,
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INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS,
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ICDR Case No. ___

REQUEST OF MANWIN LICENSING INTERNATIONAL S.A.R.L. FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCEEDING

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF CLAIM AND RELIEF SOUGHT

1. Manwin Licensing International S.à.r.l. owns and licenses the trademarks and domain names used for many of the most popular adult-oriented websites, including YouPorn.com, the single most popular free adult video website on the internet, as well as xTube.com, Pornhub.com, and Brazzers.com, to cite only a few examples. This request for independent review proceeding refers to Manwin as “YouPorn.” YouPorn hereby seeks review of certain acts and omissions of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) which acts and omissions have, as alleged more fully hereafter, violated ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. Said acts and omissions have caused or threatened to cause YouPorn injury, thereby making YouPorn an affected party within the meaning of Article 4 of
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ICANN’s Bylaws. YouPorn is therefore entitled to seek review of ICANN’s acts and omissions pursuant to Article 4 of ICANN’s Bylaws, the International Arbitration Rules of the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (“ICDR”) and the ICDR Supplementary Rules for ICANN Independent Review Process.

2. The dispute between YouPorn and ICANN, as detailed below, relates to ICANN’s improper (a) approval of inclusion of the .XXX top-level domain (“the .XXX TLD”) into the Internet Domain Name System (“DNS”), (b) administration of the process by which ICANN selected a registry operator for the .XXX TLD, (c) approval of the application of ICM Registry LLC (“ICM”) to serve as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD, and (d) agreement with ICM concerning the terms and conditions on which ICM is to act as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD. ICANN’s acts and omissions with respect to each of these matters materially violated ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws as well as local and international law.

3. Reserving its rights to amend or supplement this Request and the relief sought hereby, YouPorn respectfully requests that the Independent Review Panel (the “Panel”) grant the following relief:

a. Declare that ICANN’s approval of the .XXX TLD violated and was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

b. Declare that ICANN’s administration of the process whereby it selected a registry operator for the .XXX TLD violated and was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

c. Declare that ICANN’s approval of the application of ICM Registry LLC (“ICM”) to serve as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD violated and was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

d. Declare that ICANN’s agreement with ICM concerning the terms and conditions on which ICM is to act as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD violates and is inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;
e. Declare that ICANN must reconsider its decision regarding approval of the .XXX TLD for use in the DNS in a manner consistent with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

f. Declare that ICANN must complete proper economic studies analyzing the impact of the introduction of new TLDs, particularly the .XXX TLD, before reconsidering the .XXX TLD or approving any new TLDs;

g. Declare that ICANN’s decision approving ICM as registry operator for the .XXX TLD and the agreement between ICANN and ICM setting out the terms and conditions on which ICM would act as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD are void;

h. Declare that should ICANN, after reconsideration consistent with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, determine to allow the .XXX TLD to be used in the DNS, it must reconsider who should be allowed to act as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD in a process administered in a manner consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

i. Declare that ICM has breached the XXX Registry Agreement and the appendices and amendment thereto, and that ICANN must seek to rescind the agreement, appendices and amendments and/or other appropriate relief;

j. Declare that ICANN must, upon the expiration of the initial term of the ICM registry agreement, either allow open and fair competition for the .XXX registry and/or upon any renewal of the ICM registry agreement, negotiate conditions and terms that provide adequate protections for free and fair competition, trademarks, and other name and intellectual property rights in connection with the operation of the .XXX TLD;

k. Require that ICANN adopt “Consensus Policies” binding on ICM that protect competition, trademarks and other name and intellectual property rights;

l. Declare that ICANN must compensate YouPorn for the costs incurred by YouPorn in bringing this Independent Review Proceeding; and

m. Make such other declarations and grant such other relief as the Panel may consider appropriate.
II. THE PARTIES, COUNSEL AND CONTACT INFORMATION

A. CLAIMANT

4. YouPorn is and at all relevant times was a business entity organized as a “Société à responsabilité limitée” under the laws of Luxembourg, and having its principal place of business in the City of Luxembourg, Luxembourg. YouPorn’s contact information for purposes of these proceedings is:

Manwin Licensing International S.à.r.l.
c/o Gianfranco Salerno
7777 Boulevard Decarie, Suite 300
Montreal, QC, Canada H4P 2H2
Gianfranco.Salerno@mansef.com

5. YouPorn is represented in these proceedings by Kevin E. Gaut, Thomas P. Lambert and Jean Pierre Nogues

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP
11377 W. Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90064
keg@msk.com
tpl@msk.com
jpn@msk.com
Phone: +1 310 312 3000
Fax: +1 310 312 3100

B. RESPONDENT

6. The respondent is ICANN. ICANN’s address is:

4676 Admiralty Way, Suite 330
Marina del Rey, CA 90292-6601
USA

Phone: +1 310 823 9358
FAX: +1 310 823 8649

7. ICANN is a public benefit, non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California. It is headquartered in Marina del Rey, California.

8. ICANN was established “for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole.” ICANN Articles of Incorporation, ¶ 4. ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation further state its purposes as follows: “the Corporation shall . . . pursue the charitable and public purposes of lessening the burdens of government and promoting the global public interest in the operational stability of the Internet by (i) coordinating the assignment of Internet technical parameters as needed to maintain universal connectivity on the Internet; (ii) performing and overseeing functions related to the coordination of the Internet Protocol (‘IP’) address space; (iii) performing and overseeing functions related to the coordination of the Internet domain name system (‘DNS’), including the development of policies for determining the circumstances under which new top-level domains are added to the DNS root system; (iv) overseeing operation of the authoritative Internet DNS root server system; and (v) engaging in any other related lawful activity in furtherance of items (i) through (iv).” Id. ¶ 3. ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation require it to “carr[y] out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law.” Id. ¶ 4. ICANN is also obligated to operate “in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness” and to “be accountable to the community for operating in a manner that is consistent with [the] Bylaws, and with due regard for the core values set forth” in the organization’s Bylaws. ICANN Bylaws, Art. IV, § 1.

9. ICANN’s core function is the management of the Internet’s DNS, which includes approving the introduction of new TLDs. The DNS is a database of Internet names and addresses that correlates the “human-readable” computer names, websites, and email addresses made of letters and words with the “computer-readable” Internet Protocol (“IP”) addresses that computers
actually use to locate information, but which consist of complicated numerical strings. TLDs
appear in the human-readable addresses, or domain names, as a familiar string of letters—such as
“.COM”, “.GOV”, “.ORG”, and “.EDU”—following the rightmost “dot” in domain names.
ICANN delegates responsibility for the operation of each TLD to a registry operator.

10. In performing its functions, ICANN has committed itself to, among other things:
   a. “Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the
      functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy
      development and decision-making.”
   b. “Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain
      names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.”
   c. “Employing open and transparent policy development mechanisms that
      (i) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (ii) ensure that those
      entities most affected can assist in the policy development process.”
   d. “While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments
      and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account
      governments’ or public authorities’ recommendations.”
   e. “[I]n those cases where the policy action affects public policy concerns, to
      request the opinion of the Governmental Advisory Committee and take duly into account
      any advice timely presented by the Governmental Advisory Committee on its own
      initiative or at the Board’s request.”
   f. “[O]perating in a manner that is consistent with these Bylaws, and with due
      regard for the core values set forth in Article I of these Bylaws,” including those listed in
      Paragraph 10(a) through (d) above. Bylaws, Art. I, § 2; Art. III, § 6; Art. IV, § 1.

11. Prior to ICANN’s formation in 1998, DNS management was carried out under
    contractual arrangements between the United States Government, which developed and initially
    controlled the Internet, and other parties.

12. Beginning in 1998, the U.S. Department of Commerce (“DOC”) and ICANN
    entered into the first of a series of agreements, including a “Memorandum of Understanding” or
“MOU,” amendments thereto, and an Affirmation of Commitments relating to DOC’s delegation of authority to ICANN to manage the DNS and DOC’s role in overseeing and approving ICANN’s activities and operating the root server system. The root server system is the physical system which implements the DNS and allows users of the Internet to reach websites and email addresses. In those agreements, DOC and ICANN, among other things, agreed that ICANN would continue the process of implementing new top level domains (TLDs), which process shall include consideration and evaluation of:

a. The potential impact of new TLDs on the Internet root server system and Internet stability.

b. The creation and implementation of selection criteria for new and existing TLD registries, including public explanation of the process, selection criteria, and the rationale for selection decisions.

c. Potential consumer benefits/costs associated with establishing a competitive environment for TLD registries.

d. Recommendations from expert advisory panels, bodies, agencies, or organizations regarding economic, competition, trademark, and intellectual property issues.” Amendment 5 to MOU, ¶ II(c)(8).

13. In 2009, ICANN reaffirmed its commitments to DOC, agreeing, among other things: “ICANN will ensure that as it contemplates expanding the top-level domain space, the various issues that are involved (including competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection) will be adequately addressed prior to implementation.” September 30, 2009 Affirmation of Commitments ¶ 9.3.

14. In order to fulfill its commitments under the MOU as amended and to comply with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, the ICANN Board in 2006 instructed ICANN to conduct economic studies regarding competition issues among TLDs, including the question of whether individual TLDs compete with one another or function as self-contained markets. The U.S. Department of Justice reiterated the need for such studies in 2008.
15. Under its agreements with DOC, ICANN’s duties include determining which new TLDs to approve, choosing registries for existing or newly approved TLDs, and contracting with the registries to operate the TLDs.

16. ICANN is managed by a Board of Directors. Its day-to-day operations are overseen by its President and CEO, who is supported by an international staff.

17. Pursuant to its Bylaws, ICANN receives input from several Advisory Committees. One of those committees is the Governmental Advisory Committee (“GAC”). Membership in the GAC is open to all national governments. In addition, other multinational inter-governmental or economic organizations may under certain circumstances participate in the GAC. ICANN’s Bylaws provide:

“The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies. In the event that the ICANN Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. The Governmental Advisory Committee and the ICANN Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.” Bylaws, Art. XI, § 2.

18. Pursuant to ICANN’s Bylaws, ICANN and its Generic Names Supporting Organization (“GNSO”) are required to develop and adopt “Consensus Policies” to fulfill and implement ICANN’s obligations under its Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and the MOU, amendments thereto and Affirmation of Commitments. ICANN and its GNSO have failed to develop and adopt Consensus Policies relating to registry operators adequately protecting competition, trademarks and other name and intellectual property rights.

III. SUMMARY OF EVENTS AND FACTS UNDERLYING THIS REQUEST FOR REVIEW

19. In or about 2000, ICANN announced that it would consider applications for establishment of new TLDs. More than 40 applicants filed applications for over 150 new TLDs.
At least three applicants filed applications for the .XXX TLD. One of those applicants was ICM Registry Inc. ("ICM"), who also applied for a .KIDS TLD. See http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/tld-applications-lodged-02oct00.htm.

20. The process for considering new TLDs required that applications first be reviewed by a panel of evaluators appointed by ICANN. ICANN’s evaluators reviewed ICM’s application and recommended against adopting the .XXX TLD, writing:

"ICM Registry’s application for an .xxx TLD does not appear to meet unmet needs. Adult content is readily available on the Internet. To the extent that some believe that an .xxx TLD would segregate adult content, no mechanism (technical or non-technical) exists to require adult content to migrate from existing TLDs to an .xxx TLD.

"It is interesting to note the opposition of at least some segments of the adult online content industry to a .xxx TLD. In testimony recently presented to a United States commission chartered by the U.S. Congress to ‘identify technological or other methods that will help reduce access by minors to material that is harmful to minors on the Internet’ the COPA Commission <http://www.copacommission.org> -- the president and CEO of a leading firm in hosting services for adult sites testified: ‘While the proposition of XXX Domain is well intentioned, a XXX Domain, however, is not a global solution for the World Wide Web. It poses ethical risks to a diverse American public, financial burdens on Adult consumers and the Adult Online Community, as well as the assurance of biased censorship on the part of search portals.’

"The COPA Commission articulated some of the more common reservations about a content-specific TLD for sex-related speech, even when its content-designation is purely voluntary:
Privacy and First Amendment concerns may be raised by the clear identification of a ‘red light district’ and the stigma involved in being found there, and the concern about a ‘slippery slope’ toward mandatory location in the gTLD.

Though these concerns are certainly not universally shared outside (or even within) the United States, they indicate the degree of controversy that surrounds .xxx.

The evaluation team concluded that at this early ‘proof of concept’ stage with a limited number of new TLDs contemplated, other proposed TLDs without the controversy of an adult TLD would better serve the goals of this initial introduction of new TLDs. If an adult TLD is to be introduced, moreover, it would be beneficial to have a diversity of proposals, with a diversity of possible approaches to the various problems, from which to choose.

... Because of the inadequacies in the proposed technical and business measures to actually promote kid-friendly content, the evaluation team does not recommend selecting a .KIDS domain in the current phase of the TLD program. In addition, because of the controversy surrounding, and poor definition of the hoped-for benefits of, .xxx, we also recommend against its selection at this time.” Report on TLD Applications: Application of the August 15 Criteria to Each Category or Group (9 November 2000) located at http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/report/report-iiib1c-09nov00.htm.

ICANN moved forward with and eventually approved seven of the TLD applications received in 2000 (.BIZ, .INFO, .NAME, .PRO, .AERO, .COOP and .MUSEUM), but chose not to move forward with .XXX.

In April 2003, Michael Palage, a co-founder of ICM and member of ICM’s board, was elected to the ICANN Board.

In June 2003, ICM announced its intention to continue pursuing the .XXX TLD.
24. On December 15, 2003, ICANN announced that it would accept applications for new “sponsored” TLDs ("sTLDs"). ICANN set out criteria for “sponsorship” in its request for proposals:

“A. Definition of Sponsored TLD Community

The proposed sTLD must address the needs and interests of a clearly defined community (the Sponsored TLD Community), which can benefit from the establishment of a TLD operating in a policy formulation environment in which the community would participate. Applicants must demonstrate that the Sponsored TLD Community is:

- Precisely defined, so it can readily be determined which persons or entities make up that community; and
- Comprised of persons that have needs and interests in common but which are differentiated from those of the general global Internet community.

“B. Evidence of support from the Sponsoring Organization

Applicants must:

- Provide evidence of support for your application from your sponsoring organization; and,
- Provide the name and contact information within the sponsoring organization.

“C. Appropriateness of the Sponsoring Organization and the policy formulation environment

Applicants must provide an explanation of the Sponsoring Organization’s policy-formulation procedures demonstrating:

- Operates primarily in the interests of the Sponsored TLD Community;
- Has a clearly defined delegated policy-formulation role and is appropriate to the needs of the Sponsored TLD Community; and
• Has defined mechanisms to ensure that approved policies are primarily in the interests of the Sponsored TLD Community and the public interest.

The scope of delegation of the policy formulation role need not be (and is not) uniform for all sTLDs, but is tailored to meet the particular needs of the defined Sponsored TLD Community and the characteristics of the policy formulation environment.

“D. Level of support from the Community

A key requirement of a sTLD proposal is that it demonstrates broad-based support from the community it is intended to represent.

Applicants must demonstrate that there is:

• Evidence of broad-based support from the Sponsored TLD Community for the sTLD, for the Sponsoring Organization, and for the proposed policy-formulation process; and

• An outreach program that illustrates the Sponsoring Organization’s capacity to represent a wide range of interests within the community.” Explanatory Notes to sTLD Application found at http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/new-stdl-rfp/new-sstdl-application-parta-15dec03.htm.

25. ICM submitted the only application for the .XXX TLD under the 2003-04 sTLD program. That application was again evaluated by a team of evaluators appointed by ICANN. The team concluded, among other things, that ICM did not fulfill the sponsorship criteria for an sTLD, a key criterion for the 2003-04 sTLD application process. The panel concluded that ICM’s .XXX application did not merit further discussion.

26. Nevertheless, ICM continued to pursue its application before ICANN. The public record indicates that throughout its application process, ICM misrepresented the level of support it had from the adult entertainment community, the community for whom the .XXX TLD was purportedly to be established. For example, the public record indicates that:

a. ICM claimed that members of the adult entertainment industry who pre-registered for .XXX websites in an effort to protect their existing non-.XXX websites
supported ICM’s proposal, even though ICM had represented to the pre-registrants, many of whom opposed .XXX, that ICM would not “count” their registrations as support for the .XXX proposal;

b. ICM claimed to have support from several major adult entertainment industry companies, when in fact those entities subsequently opposed the application or took neutral positions with respect thereto;

c. ICM attempted to obtain support from the Free Speech Coalition ("FSC"), an adult entertainment industry umbrella group, by offering various inducements, including cash and International Foundation For Online Responsibility ("IFFOR") Board memberships, and by attempting to “stack” FSC meetings with supporters in order to obtain FSC’s endorsement, but such efforts failed;

d. ICM generated fake comments in support of its application by posting a link that purported to lead to additional information about the .XXX proposal, but which in fact automatically generated emails to ICANN supporting ICM’s .XXX application;

e. ICM submitted misleadingly edited videos and/or photos of an adult industry conference to suggest that there was little or no opposition to its application;

f. ICM submitted redacted information concerning alleged supporters of the .XXX application alleged to be in the adult entertainment industry who appeared not to have been involved in the industry, or whose identity as actual persons could not be verified;

g. ICM obtained and attempted to obtain support from actual and alleged participants in the industry and in related fields who were at the time or later employed or paid by, or otherwise in receipt of benefits or promises from, ICM without properly disclosing their ICM connections;

h. ICM offered various inappropriate inducements to persons and entities to support ICM’s application;
i. ICM claimed that IFFOR was an independent “sponsoring” entity for
ICM’s .XXX application when in fact IFFOR was created and is controlled by ICM and its
Chairman, Stuart Lawley; and

j. When questioned about these tactics, ICM refused to publicly disclose the
identities of its alleged supporters, ostensibly on privacy grounds, making it difficult if not
impossible for anyone to verify or challenge the veracity of ICM’s claims.

27. After numerous meetings and discussions with ICM and consideration of ICM’s
application over several meetings, and in reliance on ICM’s lobbying effort described above, in or
about June of 2005, ICANN took the preliminary step of authorizing its president and general
counsel to enter into negotiations with ICM relating to its proposal regarding the .XXX TLD. A
proposed agreement was posted on ICANN’s website in August 2005.

28. Thereafter, ICANN received many communications from members of the GAC and
various governments, including the United States Department of Commerce, expressing concerns
and opposition to the establishment of the .XXX TLD. In addition, members of the adult
entertainment industry and those opposed to the .XXX TLD on religious and moral grounds
continued to express opposition to the .XXX TLD in an ever-swelling chorus. The concerns
expressed included concerns about freedom of expression and association; about censorship by
various governments of the entire .XXX TLD; that ICM’s proposal did not have the support or
sponsorship of the adult entertainment community; and that ICM was not acting in the interest of
the very community which it contended to be the sponsoring community. In March 2006, the
GAC issued the Wellington Communiqué, which noted that several GAC members were
“emphatically opposed from a public policy perspective to the introduction of a .XXX sTLD.”
ICANN deferred final consideration of the ICM application and agreement for many months to
consider these objections and to revisit the issue of whether the .XXX TLD should be approved.

29. During this period, ICM applied pressure to ICANN and the U.S. Government to
try to force ICANN to allow ICM to proceed with the .XXX TLD. For example, ICM knew that
the U.S. Government was under international political pressure to avoid exercising control over
the internet. ICM first made Freedom of Information Act requests for sensitive documents
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relating to Internet policy, and thereafter sued the Department of Commerce and the Department of
State seeking to compel disclosure of those documents, especially those relating to the
government’s position on .XXX, all in an apparent attempt to embarrass the government and
muzzle opposition to ICM’s .XXX campaign. ICM also submitted a complaint to the ICANN
ombudsman regarding ICANN’s publication of negative evaluation reports pertaining to ICM’s
.XXX TLD application.

30. On April 4, 2006, Michael Palage, ICM’s co-founder, resigned from the ICANN
Board in the midst of a controversy about conflicts of interest.


32. On May 19, 2006, ICM filed a request for reconsideration with ICANN. That
request was amended on May 26, 2006, and withdrawn on October 1, 2006 after ICM’s counsel
allegedly received a request from ICANN’s General Counsel indicating that ICANN would revisit
its decision if ICM submitted a revised proposed contract.

33. Submissions by ICM in support of its .XXX application falsely contending that it
met sponsorship requirements, and submissions by members of the adult entertainment industry,
governmental entities, and others voicing strong opposition to the .XXX TLD continued until
March 30, 2007, when ICANN again rejected the ICM .XXX application.

34. On June 6, 2008, more than a year after ICANN rejected its application for the
.XXX TLD, ICM filed a Notice of Independent Review to challenge that decision. ICM’s central
contention in the Independent Review Proceeding (“IRP”) was that ICANN had approved ICM’s
application for the .XXX TLD in June of 2005, when its Board directed that its President and
General Counsel begin negotiating an agreement with ICM, and that ICANN thereafter improperly
and unfairly “reconsidered” its decision and rejected ICM’s application. See Declaration of Panel
in ICM v. ICANN ¶ 84 (ICM contends that ICANN had concluded that Board found sponsorship
criteria met in June of 2005 and that its reopening of that issue thereafter was “unfair,
discriminatory and pretextual”).

35. On February 19, 2009, the majority of the Independent Review Panel hearing the
ICM v. ICANN matter issued a non-binding Declaration siding with ICM, declaring that ICANN
had decided that ICM had met the criteria established for a new sTLD in June 2005 when its
Board directed that negotiations of a contract with ICM proceed, and declaring that ICANN could
not thereafter properly reopen the issue of sponsorship for reconsideration. The Panel’s
Declaration did not address the issue of whether or not sponsorship criteria were in fact met or
whether the “evidence” of sponsorship presented by ICM up through the time of the June 2005
decision supported that determination or was misleading or fraudulent. The Panel did not hear
directly from members of the adult entertainment industry, the GAC, or others vitally concerned
with and opposed to the establishment of the .XXX TLD and making ICM the registry operator for
.XXX.

36. On March 26, 2010, ICANN published a document setting forth its options in
responding to the non-binding Declaration, noting that, among other things, ICANN could accept
the majority Declaration and move forward with the ICM application, adopt the findings of the
dissenting Declaration and reject ICM’s application, adopt portions of the declarations and/or
reconsider the application under various scenarios. See http://www.icann.org/en/irp/icm-v-
icann/draft-options-post-irp-declaration-26mar10-en.pdf. Shortly thereafter, ICM sent ICANN a
“response” to the options, stating, among other things, that it was “self-evident” that litigation
would result if ICANN did not adopt the IRP majority Declaration and allow ICM to proceed with
YouPorn is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that ICM also made other threats of
litigation against ICANN, its Board members, and others it perceived as responsible in some way
for the denial of its .XXX application.

37. On June 25, 2010, ICANN’s Board adopted the IRP majority Declaration in part,
and directed its staff to undertake expedited due diligence and take other measures toward possible
approval of the ICM application.

38. On March 18 and 19, 2011, ICANN approved ICM’s application for the .XXX
TLD.

39. Throughout the period between ICANN’s rejection of the ICM application in its
March 30, 2007 decision and ICANN’s March 2011 approval of ICM’s application, and thereafter,
members of the adult entertainment industry and others, including members of GAC, continued to
object to ICANN's approval of the .XXX TLD in comments submitted in writing and
electronically and in various public fora.

40. Before approving the .XXX TLD, ICANN was consistently advised by numerous
members of the adult entertainment industry that the industry did not support inserting the .XXX
TLD into the DNS root server for a variety of reasons, including potential "ghettoization" of adult
entertainment websites, other freedom of expression and association concerns, violation of various
intellectual property and business rights, and concerns about anticompetitive conduct by the
proposed registry operator, ICM. Members of the adult entertainment industry also provided
substantial information to ICANN demonstrating that ICM's evidence of alleged "sponsorship" by
the adult entertainment industry was misleading or fraudulent, that any initial interest by members
of the industry in establishment of the .XXX TLD had eroded to the point of non-existence once
the .XXX proposal was fleshed out, and that the industry was opposed to establishment of the
.XXX TLD.

41. Before approving the .XXX TLD, ICANN received advice from various
governments and members of the GAC that they were opposed to establishment of the .XXX TLD
on various public policy grounds, including freedom of expression and association, competition,
rights protection and concerns about universal resolvability of web addresses given threatened
censorship of .XXX websites in some countries.

42. At no time prior to approval of the .XXX TLD did ICANN cause proper economic
studies to be made of the effects of introduction of new TLDs, including the .XXX TLD, on
competition and the rights of various affected parties, despite the fact that ICANN's Board and the
U.S. Depart of Justice had previously concluded that such studies were necessary to properly
evaluate new TLD requests in a manner consistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and
Bylaws and to insure compliance with international and local law. The reports that were prepared
at ICANN's behest on these subjects for the most part consisted of nothing more than unsupported
speculation and assumptions downplaying the possible adverse effects of the introduction of new
TLDs and advocating introduction of new TLDs rather than rigorous and unbiased analysis of the
facts and effects. However, those studies, as well as independent analyses submitted to ICANN concerning the potential impact of new TLDs, including the .XXX TLD, did identify negative effects on competition from the introduction of new TLDs.

43. On March 21, 2011, ICANN ultimately refused to conduct proper economic studies, stating, without any real or substantial support, that there was no economic basis for not allowing new TLDs, and asserting that “no further economic analysis will prove to be any more informative in that regard than those that have already been conducted.” See https://www.icann.org/en/minutes/rationale-economic-studies-21mar11-en.pdf.

44. ICANN never sought competitive “bids” for the .XXX registry. ICANN’s contract with ICM regarding the .XXX TLD reflects the fact that ICANN did not consider alternatives to ICM running .XXX. Among other things, it provides for automatic renewal of the registry agreement, and does not provide for competitive bidding after the initial period of the agreement. Even though it creates and grants ICM a monopoly over the .XXX TLD, it does not impose conditions and limitations on ICM’s operation of the registry (such as limitations on registration prices and processes) to protect against anticompetitive behavior by ICM. ICANN has imposed such conditions on other registry operators to ensure fairness, competitiveness and compliance with law.

45. ICANN approved .XXX and the ICM registry contract, despite these legitimate and strenuously voiced concerns, in violation of its by-laws and contractual obligations, and despite the lack of complete and requisite economic studies, only because: (a) ICANN was intimidated and coerced by ICM’s improper conduct (described above) which threatened ICANN, imposed significant economic expense on ICANN, and promised to continue such tactics if ICANN did not consent to .XXX; and (b) ICM promised ICANN significant financial payments, likely to amount to millions of dollars, under the .XXX registry contract. Reflecting that ICANN’s approvals were in part a reaction to improper ICM pressure, ICANN insisted upon and obtained a release from ICM – barring ICM from further litigation threats – as a condition to signing the .XXX registry contract.
46. ICANN and ICM entered into a registry agreement and related appendices and amendments to make ICM the registry operator for .XXX. Under the terms of those agreements, appendices and amendments, among other things:

   a. ICM represented that the statements it made in applying for the .XXX TLD and negotiating the registry agreement were true and correct (.XXX Registry Agreement §2.1(b));

   b. ICM agreed to follow “Consensus Policies,” including those relating to resolution of disputes regarding whether particular parties may register or maintain registration of particular domain names (.XXX Registry Agreement §§ 3.1(b)(i) and 3(b)(iv)(F));

   c. ICM agreed to conduct policy development in a manner that reasonably provided members of the sponsored community with the ability to express their views about such policies and to participate in policy development (.XXX Registry Agreement § 3.1(g));

   d. ICM agreed to publish, implement and enforce registry policies consistent with the Registration Agreement and ICM’s obligations under the Sponsoring Organization Agreement Appendix S to the .XXX Registry Agreement (Appendix S to .XXX Registry Agreement Part 8);

   e. ICM agreed to operate .XXX for the benefit of those who “provide online, sexually-oriented Adult Entertainment,” those who represent such providers and those who provide products or services to such providers (id.); and

   f. ICM agreed that it would only register domain names for persons who already provided sexually-oriented adult entertainment or related products or services on the Internet or who credibly proposed to provide such entertainment, products or services (id. Part 3).

47. ICM has breached and violated the terms of the registry agreement and related appendices and amendments in at least the following respects:

   a. It misrepresented its “sponsorship” during the application process;
b. It refused to block registration of websites that are confusingly similar to domain names in other TLDs, including YouPorn, unless the operators of those sites are willing to give up valuable legal rights as a condition to blocking;

c. It has ignored the input of the vast majority of the members of the online adult entertainment community in establishing the .XXX TLD and the policies governing that TLD;

d. It is operating the .XXX TLD in a manner inconsistent with the interests of those for whose benefit it agreed to operate the TLD and to maximize its own profits and to hold domain names confusingly similar to domain names for websites in other TLDs hostage to substantial payments and waivers of valuable rights demanded by ICM to block those .XXX domain names; and

e. It has knowingly sold domain names to persons and entities who are known domain name speculators, and whose expressed intent is to resell those domain names at a profit rather than use them for purposes of providing adult entertainment or related products or services.

48. Despite the foregoing material breaches of the registry agreement, appendices and amendments, ICANN has failed to take any steps to rescind the registry agreement, to compel compliance therewith or to seek other relief for ICM’s breaches thereof.

49. Since obtaining ICANN approval, ICM has set up processes for the .XXX TLD that threaten intellectual property rights of various persons and entities in and out of the adult entertainment industry, including YouPorn, has held those rights hostage to substantial payments for registration or blocking of websites using names similar to trademarks and other existing websites, and has otherwise acted in a manner that adversely affects competition and aids, abets, encourages and facilitates misappropriation and misuse of intellectual property by various wrongdoers.
IV. ICANN'S CONSENT TO THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCEDURE AND YOUPorn'S STANDING AS AN AFFECTED PARTY

50. ICANN’s consent to subject its conduct “alleged by an affected party to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws” to independent review is set forth in Article IV, Section 3 of ICANN’s Bylaws:

"1. . . . ICANN shall have in place a separate process for independent third-party review of Board actions alleged by an affected party to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

2. Any person materially affected by a decision or action by the Board that he or she asserts is inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws may submit a request for independent review of that decision or action.

3. Requests for such independent review shall be referred to an Independent Review Panel (‘IRP’)."

51. ICANN has selected the International Centre for Dispute Resolution ("ICDR") to handle requests for an IRP.

52. The procedural framework for the independent review process is set out in ICANN’s Bylaws, the ICDR’s International Arbitration Rules and ICDR’s Supplementary Procedures for ICANN Independent Review Process.

53. YOUPorn has been materially affected by ICANN’s decision to permit the .XXX TLD to be entered into the DNS root server and to allow ICM to act as the registry for the .XXX TLD in at least the following respects:

a. Under ICM’s requirements for the .XXX TLD, in order to have an .XXX website, YOUPorn must agree to unacceptable restrictions on free expression.

b. In order to register for an .XXX website or block registration of an .XXX domain name, YOUPorn must waive certain legal and other claims it has against ICM.

c. Under ICM’s published rules for the .XXX TLD, YOUPorn must either operate .XXX websites as a member of the ICM-defined community or it must declare that
it is not a member of the community to block .XXX websites matching its trademarks and 
existing non-.XXX websites; it is not permitted to operate some websites and block others 
under ICM's rules, in violation of its rights to freedom of speech and association under 
international and local law.

d. In order to protect their existing websites, trademarks, tradenames and 
intellectual property, YouPorn and others must pay substantial sums to acquire and/or 
block .XXX websites, to the detriment of fair competition.

e. Under ICM's rules for the .XXX TLD, portions of monies paid by YouPorn 
to register domain names would be diverted to IFFOR, an organization that espouses 
viewpoints with which YouPorn disagrees.

f. YouPorn has been injured by ICM's breaches of the .XXX Registry 
Agreement and the appendices and amendments thereto, and ICANN's failure to seek 
recessio thereof or other appropriate relief for such breaches.

V. APPLICABLE REVIEW STANDARD

54. Pursuant to ICANN's Bylaws, the IRP's mandate is to (1) compare those actions of 
the Board contested by an affected party to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and (2) to 
declare whether the Board has taken a decision, acted, or failed to act consistently with the 
provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

55. The Panel must therefore determine, inter alia, whether ICANN's procedures, 
processes, consideration and/or disposition of the request to establish the .XXX TLD and ICM's 
application to serve as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD were inconsistent with all or any 
part of its Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, and in particular those portions of the Articles of 
Incorporation and Bylaws cited in paragraphs 8 through 12 hereinabove, including, without 
limitation, its commitment to act in the interest of the entire community, to act in accordance with 
international and local law, and to act in a manner that promotes competition and with due regard 
for intellectual property right protection. As summarized below, YouPorn submits that ICANN 
has acted inconsistently with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.
VI. ICANN FAILED TO COMPLY WITH ITS ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION AND BYLAWS

56. ICANN’s Bylaws require that it take public policy into account in making its decisions, and that it seek and take into account the advice it receives from governments and the GAC in making its decisions. ICANN acted inconsistently with and violated its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws when, among other things:

a. It disregarded its commitment under its Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and its agreements with the DOC to adequately address issues including competition, consumer protection, malicious abuse and rights protection prior to approving the .XXX TLD and granting ICM the exclusive right to act as the .XXX registry operator without adequate safeguards with respect to such issues.

b. It disregarded its commitment under its Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and its agreements with DOC to introduce and promote competition in the registration of domain names by selecting ICM in a closed process without considering other potential registry operators for the .XXX TLD.

c. It disregarded the advice of the GAC and its members that the .XXX TLD should not be permitted because of freedom of expression and other public policy issues.

d. It failed to conduct proper economic studies of the impact of the introduction of new TLDs, including the .XXX TLD, on competition and rights protection that it agreed with DOC were necessary to fulfill its obligations under the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws to promote and adequately address competition, rights protection and other issues before approving new TLDs, including the .XXX TLD.

e. It failed to take action respecting ICM’s breaches of the .XXX Registry Agreement and the appendices and amendments thereto, allowing ICM to persist in anticompetitive conduct and in derogation of trade marks, name rights and other intellectual property rights.
57. ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws require that ICANN introduce and promote competition in approving TLDs and registries. ICANN acted inconsistently with and violated its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws when, in approving the .XXX TLD, among other things:

a. It approved the .XXX TLD and made ICM the registry operator for the .XXX TLD without adequately considering competition issues.

b. It failed to conduct proper economic studies of the impact of the introduction of the .XXX TLD’s on competition and rights protection.

c. ICANN has failed to adopt or enforce Consensus Policies that adequately protect competition, trademarks, and other name and intellectual property rights applicable to .XXX and other TLDs.

d. It failed to consider or impose conditions and restrictions on ICM’s operation of the .XXX TLD in order to adequately protect consumers, rights holders and members of the adult entertainment industry from the anticompetitive effects of granting ICM a monopoly on the .XXX TLD.

e. It failed to impose competitive terms on any renewal of ICM’s contract to control the .XXX TLD.

f. It failed to consider potential .XXX registry operators other than ICM.

g. It disregarded the advice of members of the adult entertainment industry, economists and other experts concerning the significant negative impacts that introduction of the .XXX TLD would have on competition, intellectual property rights, and freedom of expression.

58. ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws require that it conduct its activities in an open and transparent manner that promotes well-informed decisions based on expert advice and ensures that those most affected by ICANN’s actions have a voice in the process. ICANN acted inconsistently with and violated its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws when, in approving the .XXX TLD, it disregarded the comments, concerns and evidence presented by members of the adult entertainment community and experts, that, among other things:
a. ICM and the .XXX TLD did not have community support, and that assertions of “sponsorship” were fraudulent and misleading;

b. Establishment of the .XXX TLD could lead to “ghettoization” of the adult entertainment industry, and could lead to curtailment of freedom of expression through restrictions placed on websites within and outside of the .XXX TLD.

c. ICM was acting and threatening to act in a manner that was contrary to the interests of the adult entertainment industry, the “community” that ICM contended was “sponsoring” the .XXX TLD.

d. The .XXX TLD would have significant anticompetitive effects and would have substantial negative impacts on the intellectual property and other property rights of various rights holders, including YouPorn.

e. Establishment of the .XXX TLD would impose substantial costs on operators of websites and on holders of trademarks, tradenames and other intellectual property, including YouPorn, to protect their rights and interests against infringement, violation, dilution and other injury.

59. ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws require that it act in compliance with international law and conventions and local laws. ICANN acted inconsistently with and violated its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws and acted inconsistently with international law and conventions and local laws regarding competition and protection of intellectual property and other property rights by approving the inclusion of the .XXX TLD in the DNS, approving ICM’s application to act as registry operator for the .XXX TLD and in entering into an agreement with ICM for operation of the .XXX registry that did not include adequate safeguards and protection of competition and intellectual property and other rights. Among other things, granting ICM a monopoly over the .XXX TLD has allowed it to:

a. Extort and attempt to extort substantial sums from members of the adult entertainment industry and others, including YouPorn, to protect their exiting websites, trademarks and other intellectual property, whether they intend to operate websites within the .XXX TLD or block such sites.
b. Require persons registering websites for the .XXX TLD to pay money to
IFFOR, an organization controlled by ICM and its principals, even if the registrants do not
agree with IFFOR's viewpoints.

c. Unlawfully tie products and services together in violation of law, such as by
requiring that any registrant either purchase or block all websites in which it had any
affirmative or defensive interest, rather than choosing to purchase and operate some and
block others.

d. Require registrants to give up legal rights and claims they may have against
ICM as a condition of registering or blocking a website.

60. ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws require that it proceed in a fair and
open manner. ICANN acted inconsistently with and violated its Articles of Incorporation and
Bylaws when, in approving the .XXX TLD, it among other things:

a. Disregarded the criteria it had set our for sTLDs like .XXX, and approved
the .XXX TLD and ICM as registry operator of the .XXX TLD over the strong opposition
of the adult entertainment industry, the community which ICM contended was the sponsor
of the .XXX TLD, and approved the .XXX TLD even after it had become clear that ICM
had not met and could not meet the sponsorship criteria for sTLDs.

b. Prevented a fair hearing and inquiry into ICM's claims of sponsorship by
allowing ICM not to disclose the identities of its supposed supporters.

c. It failed to take heed of complaints by members of the adult entertainment
industry, members of GAC and others warning of the dangers of proceeding with the
.XXX TLD and naming ICM as the registry operator for .XXX.

d. It gave ICM a permanent monopoly over the .XXX TLD without
considering other candidates for registry operator and without making provision for
considering other potential registry operators at the end of the initial term of the .XXX
Registry Agreement.
VII. YOUPorn IS ENTITLED TO THE REQUESTED RELIEF

61. As a result of ICANN’s failures to comply with and violations of its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws as alleged herein, and reserving its rights to amend or supplement this Request and the relief sought hereby, YouPorn is entitled to the following relief:

a. A declaration that ICANN’s approval of the .XXX TLD violated and was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

b. A declaration that ICANN’s administration of the process whereby it selected a registry operator for the .XXX TLD violated and was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

c. A declaration that ICANN’s approval of the application of ICM Registry LLC (“ICM”) to serve as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD violated and was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

d. A declaration that ICANN’s agreement with ICM concerning the terms and conditions on which ICM is to act as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD violates and is inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

e. A declaration that ICANN must reconsider its decision regarding approval of the .XXX TLD for use in the DNS in a manner consistent with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;

f. A declaration that ICANN’s decision approving ICM as registry operator for the .XXX TLD and the agreement between ICANN and ICM setting out the terms and conditions on which ICM would act as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD are void;

g. A declaration that should ICANN, after reconsideration consistent with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, determine to allow the .XXX TLD to be used in the DNS, it must reconsider who should be allowed to act as the registry operator for the .XXX TLD in a process administered in a manner consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws;
h. A declaration that ICANN has failed to take action to rescind or enforce the .XXX Registry Agreement, and the appendices and amendments thereto, in the face of multiple serious breaches of same by ICM, and must, to comply with its articles and bylaws, seek such relief immediately;

i. Declare that ICANN must upon the expiration of the initial term of the ICM registry agreement either allow open and for competition for the .XXX registry and/or upon any renewal of the ICM registry agreement, negotiate conditions and terms that provide adequate protections for free and fair competition, trademarks, other name and intellectual property rights in connection with the operation of the .XXX TLD;

j. Require that ICANN adopt “Consensus Policies” binding on ICM that protect competition, trademarks and other name and intellectual property rights in connection with the operation of the .XXX TLD and other TLDs;

k. A declaration that ICANN must compensate YouPorn for the costs incurred by YouPorn in bringing this Independent Review Proceeding; and

l. Such other declarations and such other relief as the Panel may consider appropriate.

YouPorn therefore requests that the Panel make the declarations and grant the relief specified above.

IV. INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCEDURAL ELECTIONS AND PROPOSAL REGARDING PANEL SELECTION AND LOCATION OF PROCEEDINGS

YouPorn therefore requests that the Panel make the declarations and grant the relief specified above.

The ICDR does not maintain a panel of neutrals under contract for the ICANN Independent Review Process. Accordingly, YouPorn proposes that the parties agree to waive the requirement in Article IV, Section 3(4) of the Bylaws that the arbitrators be under contract with or nominated by the IRP provider.
64. Pursuant to Article IV, Section 3(6) of the Bylaws, YouPorn hereby elects that the Panel be composed of three (3) members, each of whom shall be impartial and independent of the parties.

65. Pursuant to Article IV, Section 3(7) of the Bylaws, YouPorn proposes the following methodology for constituting the Panel: each party shall appoint one panelist. The two panelists so appointed, and in consultation with the parties, shall jointly select the third panelist, who shall serve as the Chairperson of the Panel.

66. YouPorn proposes that YouPorn and ICANN make their panelist appointment within twenty (20) days of ICANN’s agreement to the Panel appointment procedure set forth herein. The two co-panelists shall select the Chairperson of the Panel within twenty (20) days of their appointment. In the event that YouPorn or ICANN fails to make its panelist appointment within the time period indicated, the ICDR shall make the appointment of YouPorn or ICANN’s panelist and the Chairperson of the Panel within thirty (30) days of the date on which said party should have made its panelist appointment. In the event that the two party-appointed panelists fail to agree on the identity of the third arbitrator, that appointment shall be made by the ICDR, in accordance with its established procedures.
67. Pursuant to Article 13 of the ICDR Rules, YouPorn proposes that the place of the IRP be Los Angeles, CA, United States of America.

Respectfully submitted,
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