

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  
27  
28

# Ex. 21

Redacted

---

**From:** Slafsky, John  
**Sent:** Monday, June 14, 2010 2:15 PM  
**To:** 'perry clark'  
**Subject:** RE: Petronas/GoDaddy

CONFIDENTIAL AND FURNISHED PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE 408

Perry --

Your e-mail messages today are very disturbing.

You could have easily secured the disputed "petronastower" domain name for your client within 60 days via the well-known UDRP arbitration process, for a small fraction of the attorney fees required of federal court litigation. Instead you opted to bring a futile TRO motion against the registrar in federal court in December, you subsequently chose to bring a separate "in rem" lawsuit in federal court, and now you are proceeding with federal court litigation against the registrar even though you control the domain name and even though each of your claims against the registrar are doomed. This has caused significant and unnecessary expense for the registrar, GoDaddy, in blatant violation of FRCP Rule 11.

Your settlement demands below are unacceptable. If your client is interested in pursuing domain name infringers, it can either bring UDRP claims or it can sue the infringers in court. It is absurd to suggest that the registrar assume your client's trademark policing burden.

You forwarded a proposed stipulation concerning a Case Management Conference on July 15 and joint submission of a Case Management Statement by July 1. These dates do not work for us. We are available, however, on July 22, in which case we would expect to file a Case Management Statement by July 8. Please forward another stipulation with these dates.

The parties will now need to exchange Initial Disclosures. We propose that the parties do this by July 15, i.e. one week before the Case Management Conference. Please confirm your agreement to this deadline.

At the Case Management Conference we intend to advise Judge Hamilton that GoDaddy will be (i) moving to dismiss this case altogether and (ii) moving for sanctions, including an attorney-fee award, against both you and your client. Under the circumstances GoDaddy is committed to proceeding with the sanctions motion even if you subsequently elect to dismiss this baseless and ill-advised lawsuit.

John Slafsky  
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati  
650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
650-320-4574 (ph)  
650-493-6811 (fax)  
jslafsky@wsgr.com

---

**From:** Perry Clark [mailto:perry@perryclarklaw.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 14, 2010 10:13 AM  
**To:** Slafsky, John  
**Subject:** Petronas/GoDaddy

CONFIDENTIAL AND FURNISHED PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE 408

John,

It has come to our attention that a website "mirroring" the website previously associated with the PETRONASTOWER.NET domain name is located at PETRONASTOWERS.NET. It appears that the PETRONASTOWERS.NET domain name is registered at GoDaddy.com, as was the PETRONASTOWER.NET domain name the Court ordered transferred to Petronas. The "registrant" also appears to be the same.

Could you please let me know whether your client would be willing to transfer the PETRONASTOWERS.NET domain name to Petronas and on what terms and conditions. In addition, please let me know if your client would consider agreeing to inform Petronas in the future when GoDaddy receives an application to register a domain name using the PETRONAS mark.

Best,  
Perry  
Law Offices of Perry R. Clark  
3457 Cowper St.  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
Tel.: 650 248 5817

This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any rev