

Case No. CV03-5045 JFW (MANx)

**DEFENDANT'S ANSWER** 

LAI-2057710v2

Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN"), in response to the complaint filed by plaintiffs Dotster, Inc., Go Daddy Software, Inc., and eNom, Inc. (collectively "Plaintiffs"), hereby answers Plaintiffs' complaint as follows:

- 1. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 1 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 1.
- 2. ICANN admits the allegations of paragraph 2, except ICANN denies that Plaintiffs' contract with ICANN "forms the basis of this litigation."
- 3. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 3 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 3 of the complaint.
- 4. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 4 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 4 of the complaint.
- 5. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 5 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 5 of the complaint.
- 6. ICANN admits that it is a California non-profit corporation with its principal place of business in Marina Del Rey, California. ICANN denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 6 of the complaint.
  - 7. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 7 of the complaint.
  - 8. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 8 of the complaint.
  - 9. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 9 of the complaint.
  - 10. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 10 of the complaint.
- 11. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 11 of the complaint and refers Plaintiffs to the Memorandum of Understanding between ICANN and the United States Department of Commerce, which speaks for itself.

- 12. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 12 of the complaint, except ICANN admits that it has entered into certain registry agreements, including an agreement with VeriSign.
- 13. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 13 of the complaint, except ICANN admits that it has entered into a Registrar Accreditation Agreement <a href="http://www.icann.org/registrars/ra-agreement-17may01.htm">http://www.icann.org/registrars/ra-agreement-17may01.htm</a> with each of the Plaintiffs.
  - 14. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 14 of the complaint.
- 15. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 15 of the complaint, except ICANN admits that it has entered into a Registrar Accreditation Agreement <a href="http://www.icann.org/registrars/ra-agreement-17may01.htm">http://www.icann.org/registrars/ra-agreement-17may01.htm</a> with each of the Plaintiffs.
- 16. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves. On that basis, ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 16 of the complaint.
- 17. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves. On that basis, ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 17 of the complaint.
- 18. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves. On that basis, ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 18 of the complaint.
- 19. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves. On that basis, ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 19 of the complaint.
- 20. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves. On that basis, ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 20 of the complaint.

- 21. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 21 of the complaint, except ICANN admits that domains may be registered for differing lengths of time.
  - 22. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 22 of the complaint.
- 23. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 23 of the complaint, except ICANN admits that the redemption grace period has a duration of thirty days.
- 24. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 24 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 24.
- 25. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 25 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 25.
- 26. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 26 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 26.
- 27. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 27 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 27.
- 28. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 28 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 28.
- 29. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 29 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 29, except ICANN admits that the maximum price for a one-year initial or renewal registration of a domain name in .COM or .NET is currently US\$6.
- 30. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 30 of the complaint, except ICANN admits that VeriSign has proposed to offer a new service referred to as WLS.

- 31. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 31 of the complaint and states that the terms of the WLS have not been finalized.
- 32. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 32 of the complaint and states that the terms of the WLS have not been finalized.
- 33. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 33 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 33.
  - 34. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 34 of the complaint.
- 35. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 35 of the complaint, except ICANN admits that some opposition was expressed when WLS was proposed by VeriSign.
- 36. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 36 of the complaint and states that the report of the Task Force speaks for itself.
- 37. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 37 of the complaint and states that the report of the Task Force speaks for itself.
- 38. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 38 of the complaint and states that the resolution of the ICANN Board speaks for itself.
- 39. ICANN admits that Plaintiff Dotster's attorney sent a letter to ICANN on or about September 9, 2002, a letter including in its subject the words "Request for review under the Independent Review Policy," and states that the letter speaks for itself. ICANN denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 39 of the complaint.
- 40. ICANN admits that Plaintiff Dotster submitted a reconsideration request to ICANN on or about September 12, 2002, and states that the reconsideration request speaks for itself. ICANN denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 40 of the complaint.
- 41. ICANN admits that the Reconsideration Committee of its Board did issue a recommendation on Dotster's request on or about May 20, 2003, and states

that the recommendation speaks for itself. ICANN denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 41 of the complaint.

- 42. ICANN admits that it adopted resolution 03.78 adopting the recommendation of the Reconsideration Committee on June 2, 2003 regarding Dotster's May 20, 2003 request, and that the resolution speaks for itself. ICANN denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 42 of the complaint.
- 43. ICANN admits that ICANN's liability to a Registrar for a breach of an Accreditation Agreement is limited to the amounts paid to ICANN as accreditation fees. ICANN states further that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves. ICANN denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 43 of the complaint.
  - 44. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 44 of the complaint.
  - 45. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 45 of the complaint.
- 46. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 46 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 46 of the complaint.
- 47. ICANN realleges and incorporates by reference its answers to paragraphs 1 through 46 above.
- 48. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves. On that basis, ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 48 of the complaint.
  - 49. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 49 of the complaint.
  - 50. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 50 of the complaint.
- 51. ICANN states that its May 20, 2003 Recommendation speaks for itself and denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 51 of the complaint.
- 52. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves and denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 52 of the complaint.

- 53. ICANN admits that it is in negotiations with VeriSign concerning WLS and denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 53 of the complaint.
- 54. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves and denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 54 of the complaint.
  - 55. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 55 of the complaint.
- 56. ICANN admits that Plaintiffs are seeking a declaration of the Court as alleged in paragraph 56 of the complaint, but denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief and denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 56 of the complaint.
  - 57. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 57 of the complaint.
- 58. ICANN realleges and incorporates by reference its answers to paragraphs 1 through 57 above.
- 59. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves and denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 59 of the complaint.
  - 60. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 60 of the complaint.
  - 61. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 61 of the complaint.
- 62. ICANN states that the terms of the Accreditation Agreements with Plaintiffs speak for themselves and denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 62 of the complaint.
- 63. ICANN is without knowledge or information sufficient to answer the allegations of paragraph 63 of the complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation of paragraph 63.
  - 64. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 64 of the complaint.
- 65. ICANN denies the allegations of paragraph 65 of the complaint and states that the terms of WLS have not yet been finalized or approved.

## THIRD SEPARATE AND ADDITIONAL DEFENSE 1 (Failure to Join a Necessary Party) 2 As to all causes of action contained in the complaint, ICANN is 3 78. informed and believes and on that basis alleges that, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(7) of 4 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in 5 part, because Plaintiffs have failed to join a necessary or indispensable party under 6 7 Rule 19 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. FOURTH SEPARATE AND ADDITIONAL DEFENSE 8 9 (Failure to Mitigate) Plaintiffs have failed to mitigate any of their alleged damages. 10 79. FIFTH SEPARATE AND ADDITIONAL DEFENSE 11 (Damages Limited by Contract) 12 ICANN's obligation to pay damages to Plaintiffs, if any, is limited by 80. 13 the terms of the Accreditation Agreement that ICANN has with each of the 14 Plaintiffs. 15 16 17 WHEREFORE, ICANN prays: For a judgment of dismissal in ICANN's favor on all causes of action 18 1. 19 in the complaint; For a declaration that ICANN has not breached the Accreditation 2. 20 Agreements with Plaintiffs; 21 For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 22 3. 23 JONES DAY Dated: August 6, 2003 24 25 26 Attorneys for Defendant INTERNET 27 CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS 28

## PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Lynne Trotti, declare:

I am a citizen of the United States and employed in Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is 555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4600, Los Angeles, California 90013-1025. On August 6, 2003, I caused to be served a copy of the within document(s):

## **DEFENDANT'S ANSWER**

- by transmitting via facsimile the document(s) listed above to the fax П number(s) set forth below on this date before 5:00 p.m.
- by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with × postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California addressed as set forth below.
- by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed Federal Express envelope and affixing a pre-paid air bill, and causing the envelope to be delivered to a Federal Express agent for delivery.
- by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.

Kathleen O. Peterson PRESTON, GATES & ELLIS LLP 1900 Main Street, Suite 600 Irvine, California 92614 Phone: (949) 253-0900

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

27

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 26

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

Executed on August 6, 2003, at Los Angeles, California.

Syrxe Kotte Lynne Trotti