00:43:39 1

00:43:46 3

00:43:46 4

00:43:48 5

00:43:50 6

00:43:52 7

00:43:58 8

00:44:01 9

00:44:04 10

00:44:09 11

00:44:10 12

00:44:12 13

00:44:17 15

00:44:20 16

00:44:21 17

00:44:27 18

00:44:28 19

00:44:31 20

00:44:35 21

00:44:38 22

00:44:41 23

00:44:45 24

00:44:47 25

14 14

:42 2

Case 5:06-cv-02554-JW Document 48-18 Filed 03/19/2007 Page 1 of 40

SOMETHING STARTED IN 2001, SO IF THAT IS THE BASIS OF THE CLAIM, WHATEVER HAPPENED IN 2001, YOU'RE TARDY.

MR. KRONENBERGER: THE MOST IMPORTANT

ISSUE, YOUR HONOR, THE MOST IMPORTANT POINT IN TIME

IS THE SERVICE OF THE ORDER WHICH, WHICH, WHICH

IT'S EITHER LATE 2003, OR AS MR. PZLAK SAYS ON 2003

OF HIS DECLARATION, THE FIRST TWO WEEKS OF 2004.

WHAT HAPPENED BETWEEN THE ISSUANCE OF THE ORDER AND ANY OTHER DATE THAT IS DIFFERENT.

MR. KRONENBERGER: THERE WAS A

STIPULATION BETWEEN PACNET AND MR. KREMEN NOT TO

ENFORCE THE ORDER BECAUSE THEY WERE WORKING OUT

ISSUES REGARDING THEIR DISPUTE AND, AND ON -- AND

THERE'S A LETTER WHICH IS EXHIBIT L, I BELIEVE,

TO --

THE COURT: HOW DOES THAT AFFECT ARIN?

MR. KRONENBERGER: IN A WAY IT DOESN'T.

YOU MAKE A GOOD POINT BUT THE REASON WHY IT WAS NOT

SERVED UPON ARIN IS BECAUSE, IS BECAUSE PACNET WAS

ON THE REGISTRATION OF THE NET BLOCKS AND, AND

MR. KREMEN HAD A DISPUTE WITH PACNET AND THERE WAS

A STIPULATION NOT TO ENFORCE THIS ORDER WHILE THEY

WORKED OUT THEIR DISPUTE. THEY DON'T WORK OUT

THEIR DISPUTE AND THEN ON EXHIBIT L YOU HAVE A

00:44:50 1 or :52 2 00:44:54 3 00:44:58 4 00:45:01 5 00:45:05 6 00:45:07 7 00:45:08 8 00:45:10 9 00:45:12 10 00:45:13 11 00:45:14 12 00:45:17 13 0 19 14 00:45:22 15 00:45:24 16 00:45:26 17 00:45:28 18 00:45:30 19 00:45:32 20 00:45:35 21 00:45:39 22 00:45:42 23 00:45:43 24

00:45:52 25

1 . .

LETTER FROM MR. IDELL TO THE ATTORNEY FOR PACNET SAYING THAT WE'RE GOING TO PROCEED TO ENFORCE.

THIS WAS NOVEMBER 6TH, 2003, A MONTH LATER THE ORDER WAS SERVED SO DECEMBER 2003, WHEREAS

MR. PZLAK SAYS JANUARY OF 2004, REGARDLESS, IT'S WITHIN THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND THAT'S RELEVANT FOR UPON CONVERSION.

THE COURT: IT BEING WHAT?

MR. KRONENBERGER: THE SERVICE WHERE AN ABSOLUTE DUTY.

THE COURT: THE SERVICE DOESN'T, THE

SERVICE DOESN'T AFFECT STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

IT'S THE FILING OF THE COMPLAINT. SERVICE IS JUST

A PROCESS BY WHICH NOTICE IS GIVEN OF A COMPLAINT.

I HAVE TO JUDGE THE TOLLING OF THE STATUTE OF THE

FILING OF THE COMPLAINT, DON'T I?

MR. KRONENBERGER: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE IMPORTANT THING IS THAT, IS THAT EACH TIME THE PLAINTIFF IS INJURED OR EACH TIME THE PLAINTIFF'S INTEREST IS INVADED THERE'S CONTINUING HARM AND THE HARM IS, IS AND THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IS CONTINUALLY RESTARTED WITH THIS CONTINUING HARM.

THE COURT: THERE IS SUCH A THING, AS I
WOULD RECOGNIZE, AND COURTS HAVE RECOGNIZED, AS, AS
THAT A HARM THAT TAKES PLACE STARTING THE STATUTE

00:45:54 1 :57 2 00:46:00 3 00:46:04 4 00:46:07 5 00:46:10 6 00:46:13 7 00:46:18 8 00:46:19 9 00:46:21 10 00:46:23 11 00:46:26 12 00:46:30 13 o 33 14 00:46:38 15 00:46:40 16 00:46:43 17 00:46:47 18 00:46:53 19 00:46:57 20

00:47:00 21

00:47:03 22

00:47:06 23

00:47:09 24

00:47:11 25

OF THE LIMITATIONS AND SO YOU'RE ABLE TO ATTACK ON SOMETHING NEW, THAT MIGHT EXTEND THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS BUT IF THE HARM IS, IS, IS THE HOLDING OF SOMETHING THAT REALLY BELONG TO THE OTHER AND FOR THAT ENTIRE PERIOD OF TIME IT CONTINUES TO BE HELD, WHAT IS YOUR ARGUMENT THAT THAT ALLOWS YOU, YOU TO HAVE AN ENDLESS STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS?

MR. KRONENBERGER: YOUR HONOR, THERE'S SPECIFIC CASE LAW THAT ADDRESSES IT AND WE WEREN'T ABLE TO PUT THIS IN OUR DOCUMENTS BECAUSE IT WAS ONLY BROUGHT UP IN THE REPLY OF ARIN. THEY BROUGHT UP A DOCTRINE DEALING WITH THE QUOTE, "LAST OVERT ACT" AND THAT FOCUSES ON NEW AND INDEPENDENT ACTS THAT OCCUR AFTER AN INITIAL AGREEMENT THAT, THAT THAT HAD HARMED FOR THE PURPOSE OF, OF CONTINUING HARM IN THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

SPECIFICALLY THE COLUMBIA STEEL CASE, 111

F.3D. 1427, IT GOES INTO THIS DISCUSSION WHERE

ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF A POLICY, JUST LIKE WE HAD IN

ARIN, ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF A POLICY IS A NEW AND

INDEPENDENT ACT FOR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND THIS

WAS AN 18-YEAR AGREEMENT IN THE COLUMBIA STEEL

CASE, 18 YEARS BUT THE COURT JUST FOCUSSED ON

14 YEARS PRIOR TO THE FILING OF THE COMPLAINT. THE

ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF THE POLICY WITHIN THAT

oo:47:14 1 FOUR YEARS WAS CONTINUING HARM WITHIN THE STATUTE
or :16 2 OF LIMITATIONS.

00:47:17 3

00:47:21 4

00:47:25 5

00:47:29 6

00:47:32 7

00:47:35 8

00:47:35 9

00:47:38 10

00:47:42 11

00:47:44 12

00:47:47 13

00:47:53 15

00:47:56 16

00:47:58 17

00:48:00 18

00:48:04 19

00:48:06 20

00:48:09 21

00:48:11 22

00:48:16 23

00:48:18 24

00:48:18 25

50 14

SO THIS IS, THIS LINE OF CASE LAW

STARTING WITH COLUMBIA STEEL, HENNIGAN, 787 F.2D

1289 IS ANOTHER CASE AND IT DEALS WITH THE

AGREEMENT TO DIVERT CUSTOMERS OVER A LONG PERIOD OF

TIME JUST PRIOR TO THE FILING OF THE CASE WE'RE

ANALYZED.

THE COURT: I'LL LOOK AT THAT. THAT IS A
CASE SIMILAR TO THIS WHERE THE DEFENDANT REFUSED TO
DO SOMETHING AT THE VERY BEGINNING OF THE RUNNING
OF THE STATUTE, CONTINUED TO REFUSE TO DO WHATEVER
IT WAS SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, LET'S TAKE THAT OFF,
JUST REFUSE TO TRANSFER, AND, AND THE COURT ALLOWED
AN 18-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS?

MR. KRONENBERGER: IN ESSENCE, YES.

THE COURT: I'LL TAKE A LOOK AT THAT. IT

JUST SEEMS TO ME THAT WHAT THAT MEANS IS, IS THAT

WHEN YOU PUT SOMEONE ON NOTICE THAT THEY'RE HOLDING

SOMETHING, THERE IS NO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND I

JUST HAVEN'T SEEN ENOUGH CASE LAW TO CONVINCE ME OF

THAT, ESPECIALLY AN ANTITRUST CASE.

MR. KRONENBERGER: THAT WAS AN ANTITRUST CASE?

THE COURT: SO THAT'S WHAT I NEED TO LOOK

00:48:20 1

00 '9:20 2

00:48:21 3

00:48:23 4

00:48:29 5

00:48:32 6

00:48:34 7

00:48:40 8

00:48:47 9

00:48:48 10

00:48:50 11

00:48:52 12

00:48:56 13

00:48:59 15

00:49:00 16

00:49:03 17

00:49:06 18

00:49:11 19

00:49:14 20

00:49:17 21

00:49:19 22

00:49:22 23

00:49:24 24

00:49:29 25

:56 14

AT.

MR. KRONENBERGER: YOUR HONOR, THERE ARE
TWO OTHER CASES THAT DEAL WITH ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT
OF ILLEGAL AGREEMENTS, AIRLINE WELD, 742 F.2D 1194,
AND AURORA ENTERPRISES 688 --

THE COURT: AND IN WHAT SENSE IS THIS

CASE INVOLVE -- THEY SAY IN LAW SCHOOL ALWAYS STOP

AND GET THE QUESTION BUT YOU DON'T ALWAYS OBEY THAT

STUFF ANYWAY SO.

IN WHAT SENSE DOES THIS CASE INVOLVE

ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT?

MR. KRONENBERGER: THIS ENTIRE LINE OF

CASES.

THE COURT: THIS CASE.

MR. KRONENBERGER: THE ARIN CASE, THE
AGREEMENT IS THE ARIN POLICY WHICH IS THE HEART OF
THE ANTITRUST MATTER. IT'S THE ARIN POLICY OF
REQUIRING THIS, THIS -- A GREAT AMOUNT OF
INFORMATION BEING COLLECTED FROM PEOPLE WHO NEED IP
ADDRESS BLOCKS AND THEN, AND THEN BEING ABLE TO
SELECTIVELY AND UNDER THE PURE AND ABSOLUTE
DISCRETION OF ARIN DECIDE WHO GETS ADDRESS BLOCKS
AND WHO DOESN'T AND THE --

THE COURT: DOES THAT HAPPEN HERE?

MR. KRONENBERGER: YES, YOUR HONOR.

00:49:29 1 THERE'S A HUGE BUSINESS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES: or `:36 2 GET THE COMPANY AND THERE'S NO PROBLEM AT ALL BUT SMALL BUSINESSES THEY WANT TO GET NET BLOCKS AND 00:49:39 3 OBTAIN NET BLOCKS TO RUN THEIR BUSINESS AND IT'S A 00:49:41 4 00:49:45 5 HUGE PROBLEM. THERE ARE HUGE DELAYS AND THE DELAYS 00:49:47 6 ARE PUT IN PLACE BECAUSE THERE'S AN INCENTIVE FOR 00:49:52 7 LARGE COMPANIES TO PROHIBIT SMALLER PLAYERS TO GET 00:49:55 8 INTO THE MARKET BECAUSE SMALL COMPANIES LEASE IN 00:49:59 9 TURN IP BLOCKS FROM THE BIGGER COMPANIES IF THEY CAN'T GET THEM FROM ARIN. SO THERE'S AN INCENTIVE 00:50:01 10 00:50:04 11 FOR LARGE TELECOMMUNICATION COMPANIES WHO CONTROL ARIN AND THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND BOARD OF 00:50:08 12 00:50:10 13 ADVISORS, THERE'S AN INTEREST OF THOSE ADVISORS IN PROHIBITING PLAYERS FROM ENTERING THE MARKET LIKE 14 14 00:50:16 15 MR. KREMEN. 00:50:18 16 SO AS YOU SEE, YOUR HONOR, WE'RE NOT 00:50:20 17 DEALING JUST WITH THE SEPTEMBER 2001 ORDER. THE COURT: NOW, LET ME ASK THIS, IF I 00:50:23 18 00:50:25 19

00:50:27 20

00:50:30 21

00:50:37 22

00:50:39 23

00:50:42 24

00:50:47 25

THE COURT: NOW, LET ME ASK THIS, IF I

FIND CONSISTENT WITH MY EARLIER DISCUSSION THAT

IT'S LEGITIMATE FOR ARIN TO HAVE REQUIRED

MR. KREMEN TO SIGN WHATEVER RESTRICTIONS IT IMPOSED

UPON REGISTRANTS, WHETHER THEY BE WHAT MR. COHEN

HAD IN HIS POSSESSION OR AS REVISED LATER, IS THERE

ANYTHING TO YOUR ANTITRUST CLAIM?

MR. KRONENBERGER: THE ANTITRUST CLAIM IS

00:50:49 1	NOT AFFECTED IN ANY WAY.
or :50 2	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO IT'S MERE
00:50:52 3	EXISTENCE AND REQUIREMENT THAT YOU SIGN ANYTHING
00:50:54 4	THAT IS AT THE HEART OF YOUR ANTITRUST CLAIM?
00:51:00 5	MR. KRONENBERGER: THAT'S RIGHT, AND THE
00:51:01 6	SPECIFICS IN THEIR
00:51:03 7	THE COURT: I STICK MY NECK OUT. DO YOU
00:51:05 8	HAVE ANY CASE AUTHORITY TO FIND OUT THAT ARIN'S
00:51:09 9	PRACTICED EXISTENCE IN WHAT IT REQUIRED PEOPLE TO
00:51:12 10	DO VIOLATED THE ANTITRUST LAW?
00:51:14 11	MR. KRONENBERGER: IT'S CLEARLY
00:51:15 12	DISCRIMINATORY.
00:51:16 13	THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY CASE
oį 17 14	AUTHORITY?
00:51:18 15	MR. KRONENBERGER: ACTUALLY I WOULD LIKE
00:51:20 16	PERMISSION.
00:51:21 17	THE COURT: ANYONE BRING ME CASE
00:51:22 18	AUTHORITY THAT I CAN READ SOME OTHER JUDGE WHAT
00:51:25 19	YOU'RE ASKING ME TO DO.
00:51:28 20	MR. HANLEY: GOOD MORNING. TERRI HANLEY
00:51:29 21	FOR PLAINTIFF GARY KREMEN. I BELIEVE YOUR HONOR
00:51:32 22	HAS GOTTEN TO THE HEART OF THE SUBSTANTIVE ATTACKS
00:51:35 23	ON OUR ANTITRUST CLAIMS IN THIS MATTER.
00:51:37 24	NOW, YOU'VE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE CASE
00:51:39 25	LAW ESTABLISHES THAT AN INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, AN

AFFILIATE GROUP CAN BE LIABLE FOR ANTITRUST

ACTIVITIES. YOUR QUESTION IT SEEMS TO BE IS HOW

HAS ARIN'S CONDUCT IN THE PRESENT CASE VIOLATED

THOSE LAWS?

00:51:42 1

or -:46 2

00:51:48 3

00:51:51 4

00:51:52 5

00:51:54 6

00:51:56 7

00:51:59 8

00:52:03 9

00:52:06 10

00:52:07 11

00:52:09 12

00:52:12 13

0, 15 14

00:52:18 15

00:52:21 16

00:52:23 17

00:52:28 18

00:52:31 19

00:52:36 20

00:52:38 21

00:52:40 22

00:52:47 24

00:52:49 25

00:52:42 23

THE COURT: THAT WAS AN EARLIER QUESTION

BUT THE PENDING ONE IS GIVE ME SOMETHING THAT I CAN

READ THAT WILL HELP ME TO FOLLOW SOMEONE ELSE'S

LEAD. I LIKE WELL WORN PATHS. THEY USUALLY ARE

SAFER SO.

MR. HANLEY: THE ANSWER, YOUR HONOR, IS
THAT CONTRARY TO OPPOSING COUNSEL'S
CHARACTERIZATION OF THE COMPLAINT, IT IS NOT MERELY
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICIES, MERELY THE
REQUIREMENT OF THE SUBMISSION OF DETAILED
INFORMATION BY APPLICANTS FOR IP ALLOCATIONS.

THE HARM COMES AND HAS BEEN NOTED

PREVIOUSLY THAT, THAT A GROUP OF SELF-INTERESTED

ECONOMIC INDUSTRY PARTICIPANTS TOOK IT UPON

THEMSELVES TO LOBBY FOR AND CREATE THE PRIVATE

INDUSTRY THAT IS NOW ARIN.

THE BOARD OF ARIN, WHICH IS SPECIFICALLY
PLED AND IDENTIFIED IN THE COMPLAINT BY NAME, BY
INDUSTRY AFFILIATION, BY GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION,
CONTROL EXCLUSIVELY THE ENTRY INTO THE MARKET FOR
IP NUMBERS, ALLOCATIONS AND THEIR USE.

00:52:52 1

or :56 2

00:52:58 3

00:53:00 4

00:53:05 5

00:53:08 6

00:53:12 7

00:53:14 8

00:53:15 9

00:53:18 10

00:53:21 11

00:53:24 12

00:53:31 13

0. :34 14

00:53:35 15

00:53:38 16

00:53:42 17

00:53:46 18

00:53:49 19

00:53:54 20

00:53:55 21

00:53:56 22

00:53:59 23

00:54:00 24

00:54:03 25

NOW, IT'S BEEN OBSERVED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT.

THE COURT: NOW, LET ME SEE IF I FOLLOW

THAT. I CAN HEAR A CLAIM, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, IF

YOU CONVINCE ME THAT ARIN IS CONTROLLED BY A GROUP

OF LARGER COMPANIES WHO CONSPIRE TOGETHER TO KEEP

SMALLER COMPANIES FROM GETTING SOMETHING THAT WOULD

GIVE THEM ECONOMIC POWER.

AND THAT WOULD BE THESE IP ADDRESSES AND SO WHAT YOU'RE DESCRIBING FOR ME, ARIN IS NOT A LEGITIMATE ENTERPRISE. IT'S A CONSPIRACY OF, OF ITS BOARD TO, TO DENY SOMETHING TO, TO THE MARKET, THE COMPETITION OF SMALLER COMPANIES OWNING IP ADDRESSES.

DO YOU TAKE THE SAME POSITION AS YOUR
OPPONENT WHICH IS THE ONE THAT I ASKED THAT IF ARIN
SAID TO, TO MR. KREMEN ALL WE WANT YOU TO DO IS
SIGN WHAT EVERYBODY ELSE HAS SIGNED, THAT THAT
WOULD STILL AMOUNT TO AN ANTITRUST VIOLATION?

MR. HANLEY: IT WOULD, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: I'VE GOT THAT. NOW, IS THERE ANY CASE LIKE THIS?

MR. HANLEY: YES, YOUR HONOR. AND IN FACT, IT'S A CASE CITED IN OPPOSING COUNSEL'S OWN MOVING PAPER.

00:54:03 1

00,74:05 2

00:54:08 3

00:54:11 4

00:54:14 5

00:54:16 б

00:54:19 7

00:54:21 8

00:54:24 9

00:54:27 10

00:54:30 11

00:54:30 12

00:54:32 13

0 :34 14

00:54:36 15

00:54:40 16

00:54:43 17

00:54:44 18

00:54:47 19

00:54:54 20

00:54:56 21

00:54:59 22

00:55:04 23

00:55:10 24

00:55:16 25

THE COURT: GIVE ME THE CITE.

MR. HANLEY: U.S. V GRENELL WHICH IS

ADDRESSED IN OUR OPPOSITION PAPERS ON PAGE 18.

THERE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HELD THAT IS AN

UNLAWFUL MONOPOLY FOR AN ASSOCIATION TO EXCLUDE BY

MEANS OF RESTRICTED ENTRY CONTRACTS INTO A

COMPETITIVE MARKET. THAT IS EXACTLY THE ACTIVITY

THAT HAS BEEN CONDUCTED HERE ON THE PART OF ARIN AS

THEY HAVE IDENTIFIED OVER 11,000 TIMES AND, AND

INCLUDING IN THE CASE OF MR. KREMEN BUT NOT LIMITED

TO THAT CASE.

THE COURT: HOW LONG HAS ARIN BEEN AROUND?

MR. HANLEY: IT'S DEBATABLE AS TO WHETHER

IT'S STILL AROUND OR THEY EXIST NOW LEGALLY. THEY

CLAIM TO BE IN OPERATION I BELIEVE SINCE 1998.

THE COURT: AND HAS THERE BEEN ANOTHER

CASE INVOLVING ARIN HOLDING THAT IT IS VIOLATING

THE ANTITRUST LAWS OR HAS THE ISSUE COME UP?

MR. HANLEY: TWO PENDING LAWSUITS

INVOLVING ICAM, WHICH IS THE ORGANIZATION THAT WE

ALLEGE ARIN ATTEMPTS TO DERIVE ITS POWER. THE

ACTUAL CONTRACT THAT WOULD EVEN, WOULD EVEN

PLAUSIBLY LEGITIMIZE ARIN'S AT THIS POINT HAS BEEN

YET TO BE EXECUTED. THERE IS NO EXISTING OPERATION

00:55:18 1 AGREEMENT AT THIS TIME THAT AUTHORIZES ARIN'S 00 J:21 2 POSITION IN THE MARKET AND THAT CREATES EVEN MORE 00:55:23 3 OF THE, OF THE CAST, THE GREATER PALLOR OF THIS ANTICOMPETITIVE ACTION IN THAT THEY CAN'T CLAIM THE 00:55:27 4 00:55:30 5 QUASI GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY THAT I CAN'T ENJOY AND ICAM ITSELF IS SUBJECT TO TWO LAWSUITS CURRENTLY 00:55:34 6 00:55:38 7 PENDING. THE COURT: WELL, THIS IS A FASCINATING 00:55:39 8 00:55:41 9 AREA FOR ME AND I'LL TAKE A LOOK AT IT. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT AT THE HEART OF MY 00:55:43 10 00:55:46 11 ATTITUDE IS THE QUESTION THAT I KEEP ASKING, 00:55:49 12 NAMELY, IS THERE ANYTHING TO THE ANTITRUST CASE IF 00:55:55 13 I FIND THAT MR. KREMEN'S REFUSAL, PRESUMING THERE 0, 58 14 WAS ONE, TO SIGN THE REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT AND, AND ONCE I GET PASSED THAT, I'LL LOOK A LITTLE MORE 00:56:03 15 CAREFULLY AT THIS QUESTION OF THE STATUTE OF 00:56:06 16 00:56:11 17 LIMITATIONS AND, AND IF I GET PASSED THE STATUTE OF 00:56:15 18 LIMITATIONS I'LL GET INTO THE SUBSTANCE OF THESE

ANTICOMPETITIVE.

00:56:18 19

00:56:21 20

00:56:25 21

00:56:29 22

00:56:32 23

00:56:34 24

00:56:36 25

MR. HANLEY: NOT JUST THE EXISTENCE OF THE REGISTRY BUT THE PROCEDURES THAT ARE REQUIRED

ALLEGATIONS THAT ARIN, ARIN BY ITS VERY EXISTENCE

REQUIREMENT ITSELF TO, TO SIGN UP THE REGISTRATION

AND WHAT IT REQUIRES, IN OTHER WORDS, IT'S THE

AND, AND BE A PART OF THIS REGISTRY THAT IS

TO OBTAIN THE REGISTRATION, NOT ONLY THE OBTAINMENT 00:56:39 1 OF IT BUT THE MONITORING, THE GRAB BACK PROVISIONS or :41 2 THAT WE NOTICED NOT TO MENTION THE FACT THAT THE 00:56:44 3 ENTIRE TIME FOLLOWING THE ALLOCATION YOU HAVE NOW 00:56:47 4 00:56:50 5 PUT IN THE POSSESSION OF YOUR PRIMARY COMPETITORS DETAILED, AND I MEAN VERY HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL 00:56:53 б 00:56:56 7 INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR NETWORK OPERATIONS DOWN TO THE NAME OF THE LAPTOP THAT THE CFO OR CEO WOULD 00:56:59 8 BE OPERATING ON. AND THE AMOUNT OF DETAIL IS 00:57:03 9 AMAZING AND YOU HANDED IT OVER TO YOUR COMPETITORS 00:57:06 10 WHO HAVE THE POWER TO TAKE IT OVER AT ANY POINT. 00:57:09 11 THE COURT: IS THERE ANY EVIDENCE THAT 00:57:12 12 YOU WOULD PROFFER TO THE COURT THAT IT HAS BEEN 00:57:13 13 ABUSED? 15 14 MR. HANLEY: WELL, AGAIN, WE'RE AT THE 00:57:17 15 PLEADING STAGE AT THIS POINT. OF COURSE WE PLAN TO 00:57:19 16 00:57:24 17 CONDUCT DISCOVERY. THE COURT: YOU DON'T HAVE ANYTHING LIKE 00:57:24 18

THAT AT THIS POINT.

MR. HANLEY: NOT AT THIS POINT, YOUR HONOR.

00:57:26 19

00:57:27 20

00:57:28 21

00:57:28 22

00:57:30 23

00:57:33 24

00:57:35 25

THE COURT: VERY WELL. THANK YOU. I'LL HAVE THIS ENTIRE MATTER UNDER SUBMISSION. I'LL GIVE YOU AN ORDER SHORTLY.

MR. HUMMEL: YOUR HONOR, VERY BRIEFLY.

00:57:36 1 THE COURT: YES. or ::37 2 MR. HUMMEL: THERE WAS A CASE MANAGEMENT 00:57:38 3 CONFERENCE IN THIS MATTER TO SET FOR 10:00 O'CLOCK. 00:57:42 4 DOES IT MAKE SENSE TO PUT THAT OVER? 00:57:44 5 THE COURT: YES, I'LL VACATE THAT AND 00:57:47 6 I'LL ADDRESS WHAT THE CASE IS AND WE'LL BRING IT ALL IN AND TALK ABOUT WHERE WE GO FROM THERE. 00:57:50 7 00:57:53 8 MR. HUMMEL: THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. 00:57:55 9 MR. IDELL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 00:58:10 10 (WHEREUPON, THE PROCEEDINGS IN THIS MATTER 00:58:10 11 WERE CONCLUDED.) 00:58:10 12 00:58:10 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

.2

1.2

1,5

- 1.9

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT
REPORTER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH
FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY
CERTIFY:

THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT,

CERTIFICATE, INCLUSIVE, CONSTITUTED A TRUE, FULL

AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES TAKEN

AS SUCH OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE PROCEEDINGS

HEREINBEFORE ENTITLED AND REDUCED BY COMPUTER-AIDED

TRANSCRIPTION TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.

Oven Rodriguez

IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER CSR 8074 Case 5:06-cv-02554-JW Document 48-18 15 (lech03/19/2007 Page 15 of 40,

## Blanchard, Judith

From:

Lerner, Brian

Sent:

Tuesday, November 14, 2006 8:00 PM

To:

Ryan, Stephen; Yeh, Jack

Cc:

Hummel, Chad

Subject:

RE: ARIN's transcript of hearing -- Good news, it's here.

Attachments:

102306cv.pdf



102306cv.pdf (100 KB)

Thankfully, we finally received the transcript. However, upon reading it, there are a few misspellings of important words, including Mr. Plzak's name, which was incorrectly spelled "Mr. Zlak." Also, the words "UU NET" should be changed to one word, namely, "UNNET." I requested that the Court Reporter make the corrections and e-mail the modified transcript to me asap. I anticipate receiving the modified transcript by tomorrow.

I attached a .pdf copy of the original transcript we received today for your review.

Cordially, Brian G. Lerner manatt | phelps | phillips 11355 West Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90064

( (310) 312-4228

7 (310) 312-4224 (general)

\* blerner@manatt.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it, may contain confidential information that is legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this message is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by reply e-mail at blerner@manatt.com or by telephone at 310-312-4220, and destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading them or saving them to disk. Thank you.

----Original Message----

From: Ryan, Stephen

Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2006 5:08 AM

To: Lerner, Brian; Yeh, Jack

Subject: RE: ARIN's transcript of hearing -- Good news, it's almost here.

When we get it let's pdf so I can send to business week.

Sent from my GoodLink Wireless Handheld (www.good.com)

----Original Message----

From: Lerner, Brian

Sent: Monday, November 13, 2006 09:04 PM Pacific Standard Time

To: Yeh, Jack; Ryan, Stephen

Subject: RE: ARIN's transcript of hearing -- Good news, it's almost here.

We will hopefully have the transcript by tomorrow. The Court Reporter informed me that she's almost finished and requested that I provide her with the correct spelling of

## Case 5:06-cv-02554-JW Document 48-18 Filed 03/19/2007 Page 16 of 40

certain names, which I did. She's in trial now, but promised to send the transcript asap.

Cordially, Brian G. Lerner manatt | phelps | phillips 11355 West Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90064

- ( (310) 312-4228
- 7 (310) 312-4224 (general)
- \* blerner@manatt.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it, may contain confidential information that is legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this message is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by reply e-mail at blerner@manatt.com or by telephone at 310-312-4220, and destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading them or saving them to disk. Thank you.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

GARY KREMEN, ET AL., ) C-98-20718-JW ) C-06-2554-JW ) C-06-2554-JW ) OCTOBER 23, 2006 V. ) OCEAN FUND ) INTERNATIONAL, LTD., ET ) PAGES 1-52 AL., ) DEFENDANTS. )

AND RELATED CASE. )

THE PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD BEFORE
THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT

JUDGE JAMES WARE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: KRONENBERGER HANLEY

BY: KARL S. KRONENBERGER TERRI R. HANLEY 220 MONTGOMERY STREET

SUITE 1920

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

IDELL & SEITEL

BY: RICHARD J. IDELL 465 CALIFORNIA STREET

SUITE 300

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE.)

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, CRR
CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074

Г			
	Page 2		Page 4
1		1	FALL OUT IF YOU ADDRESS THAT ISSUE FIRST.
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: DILLON GERARDI	2	THE COURT: VERY WELL.
3		3	MR. RYAN: LET ME SAY WHY WE ARE SEEKING
1	4660 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE	4	TO CHANGE THAT ORDER? FIRST OF ALL, IT WAS
4		5	OBTAINED IN AN EX PARTE FASHION WHEN THERE WAS
5	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92122	6	ABSOLUTELY NO EMERGENCY REASON TO DO SO.
6		7	DURING THE COURSE OF THE REPRESENTATIONS
	BY: STEPHEN M. RYAN	8	THAT WERE MADE TO THE COURT, THERE WERE, THERE
7		9	WERE
8	JACK S. YEH 700 12TH STREET, N.W.	10	THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
ľ	SUITE 1100	11	MR. RYAN: THE AMERICAN REGISTRY OF
9	WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005	12	INTERNET NUMBERS IS ESSENTIALLY THE REGISTRY WHERE
10		1	ONE HAS TO GO TO OBTAIN IP ADDRESSES IN LARGE
11		14	QUANTITIES. YOU CAN ALSO OBTAIN THEM FROM AN ISP.
13		15	,,,,,,
14		16	GIVE YOU NUMBERS AS WELL. BUT WITH REGARD TO THESE
15		17	NET BLOCKS WE ISSUED THEM APPROPRIATELY TO
16		18	MR. COHEN. WE HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH MR. KREMEN'S
18		1	LAWSUIT.
19		20	WHEN THE COURT'S ORDER WAS ISSUED IT WAS
20		ł	PREMISED I BELIEVE BASED ON REPRESENTATIONS THAT
21		1	MR. KREMEN MADE THAT WERE INCORRECT OR FALSE.
23		23	ONE OF THOSE REPRESENTATIONS IS THAT
24		1	MR. KREMEN SAID IN HIS AFFIDAVIT, COHEN IS A
25		25	SUPPORTER OF ARIN THAT MAKES VOLUNTARILY DONATIONS
]	Page 3		Page 5
1	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA OCTOBER 23, 2006	1	TO ARIN. THAT'S SIMPLY NOT TRUE. EVERYBODY IS
2	PROCEEDINGS	2	REQUIRED TO SIGN A SERVICE AGREEMENT IF YOU WANT TO
3	(WHEREUPON, COURT CONVENED AND THE.	3	GET ISSUED THE IP ORDERS AND THEY HAVE TO BE DONE
4	FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD:)	4	THAT WAY.
5	THE CLERK: CALLING CASE NUMBER C-06-2554,	5	SO THE COURT EITHER RECEIVED
6	GARY KREMEN VERSUS AMERICAN REGISTRY FOR INTERNET	6	REPRESENTATIONS FROM MR. KREMEN THAT WERE EITHER
7	NUMBERS.	7	FALSE OR UNINTENTIONALLY MISLEADING.
8	MR. RYAN: STEVE RYAN FROM THE MANATT LAW	8	IN ADDITION THE WAY WE WORK WITH THESE
9	FIRM ACCOMPANIED BY MR. HUMMEL AND MR. YEH ON	9	RESOURCES, YOUR HONOR, WE ISSUE THEM PROPERLY TO
10	BEHALF OF DEFENDANT ARIN WHO IS THE MOVANT ON THE	10	PEOPLE WHEN THEY SIGN AN AGREEMENT TO US.
11	MOTION TO, TO CHANGE THE 2001 ORDER.	11	WHEN THEY'RE DONE WITH THEM OR THE COURT
12	THE COURT: GOOD MORNING.	12	ORDERS US TO, TO CHANGE THAT, WE HAVE TO REVOKE
13	MR. HUMMEL: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.	13	THEM FROM THE ONE PARTY AND THEN REISSUE THEM TO
14	MR. YEH: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.	14	THE NEXT PARTY. THEY AREN'T JUST TRANSFERRED FROM
15	MR. KRONENBERGER: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.	15	ONE PARTY TO ANOTHER.
16	KARL KRONENBERGER FOR GARY KREMEN AND ACCOMPANIED	1	SO WHEN THE COURT IS BEING ASKED BY
17	BY MY COLLEAGUE TERRI HANLEY AND MR. IDELL, AND I'M	17	MR. KREMEN IN AN EX PARTE WAY WAS ASKED TO REGISTER
18	SORRY, AND MR. TIM DILLON.	18	THE RESOURCES TO MR. KREMEN, THAT'S NOT HOW WE DO
19	THE COURT: VERY WELL. VERY WELL.  MP. P.VAN, THIS IS VOUD OF FENTIS MOTION TO DISMISS.	19	BUSINESS. IN ESSENCE WE GIVE THEM TO SOMEONE, WE
20	MR. RYAN, THIS IS YOUR CLIENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS.	20	HAVE TO REVOKE THEM AND THEN REISSUE THEM.
21	MR. RYAN: YOUR HONOR, THERE ARE TWO	21	THROUGHOUT THIS PROCESS WE HAVE BEEN
22	MOTIONS BEFORE THE COURT THIS MORNING. MR. HUMMEL		FULLY WILLING, EVEN THOUGH THE ORDER WAS DONE EX
23			PARTE, TO GIVE HIM THE RESOURCES.
24	WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS IS THE 2001	24	HE HAS BEEN UNWILLING AND ABSOLUTELY
23	ORDER BECAUSE WE BELIEVE MANY OF THE ISSUES WILL	25	UNYIELDING IN HIS INTENTION NOT TO SIGN ANY OF THE

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

- 1 NECESSARY PAPERWORK THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
- 2 THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ANY ISP LIKE
- VERIZON OR SBC, ANY INDIVIDUAL, EVERYONE SINCE 1998
- WHO HAS WANTED RESOURCES HAS BEEN ASKED TO SIGN AN
- AGREEMENT SAYING THAT THEY WILL USE THE RESOURCES
- PROPERLY, THAT THEY'LL PAY FOR THE SERVICES ON A
- 7 REGULAR BASIS AND IF THEY'RE MISUSED IT GIVES THE
- 8 COMMUNITY THE RIGHT TO RESOURCES. HE'S ABSOLUTELY
- REFUSED. SO THE REASON THAT THE RESOURCES HAVE NOT
- 10 BEEN TRANSFERRED TO HIM IS SOLELY HIS OWN DOING.
- 11 WITH REGARD TO WHY THE COURT SHOULD
- 12 CHANGE THE ORDER IT'S IN ESSENCE A MISREADING OF
- 13 YOUR ORDER IN 2001 THAT HE DID NOT HAVE TO COMPLY
- WITH ANY OF THE ACTIVITIES THAT A NORMAL APPLICANT 14
- 15 OR REGISTRANT WOULD DO.
- 16 WE BELIEVE THAT THE ONLY APPROPRIATE WAY
- 17 TO DEAL WITH THIS IS TO NOT GIVE HIM GREATER RIGHTS
- THAN ANYONE ELSE IN THE INTERNET COMMUNITY. WHAT
- 19 HE'S ASKING FOR IS THAT WE TRANSFER THESE RIGHTS TO
- HIM WITHOUT ANY SERVICE AGREEMENT, WITHOUT ANY DUTY
- 21 FOR HIM TO PAY IN THE FUTURE AND WITH HIS ABILITY
- TO MISUSE THE RESOURCES IF HE CHOSE WITHOUT US
- 23 HAVING A CONTRACTUALLY BASED RIGHT IN THE SERVICE
- 24 AGREEMENT TO DEAL WITH THAT.
- 25 THE RESOURCES THAT WERE ISSUED, THERE'S

UNIQUE NUMBERS TO EACH PARTY FOR THE PERIOD THAT

Page 8

- 2 THEY'RE ENTITLED TO USE THEM.
- 3 WHEN THEY'RE NOT ENTITLED TO USE THEM WE
- 4 BRING THEM BACK AND PUT THEM BACK IN THE TREASURY
- AND RE-ISSUE THEM TO THE NEXT PARTY.
- 6 THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU DO IF THERE'S A 7
  - CONFLICT?

12

- 8 MR. RYAN: THERE'S NO CONFLICT FROM OUR
- PROCESS. WE ARE THE "WHO IS" DIRECTORY. WHEN WE
- PUBLISH SOMETHING, THIS IS THE AUTHORITATIVE LIST
- 11 OF WHO HAS THE RIGHT TO THOSE RESOURCES.
  - THE COURT: THE PEOPLE, THE THIRD PARTIES
- 13 YOU'RE NOW TELLING ME ABOUT, HOW DID THEY COME
- 14 TO -- THROUGH WHOM DID THEY OBTAIN RIGHTS?
- 15 MR. RYAN: SO WHEN WE ISSUED THE ORIGINAL
- 16 RESOURCES TO COHEN OR TO A COHEN ASSOCIATED ENTITY, THEY THEN WOULD USE THOSE RESOURCES TO PROVIDE AN
- INDIVIDUAL, SAY A STUDENT, OR, OR A BUSINESS WITH
- THOSE, WITH THOSE NUMBERS TO DO BUSINESS WITH THEIR 20 ISP.
- 21 THE COURT: YOU'RE GIVING ME THAT AS A
- HYPOTHETICAL BUT CAN YOU TRACE THROUGH NOW TO KNOW
- **EXACTLY WHO THE THIRD PARTIES ARE?**
- 24 MR. RYAN: NO, WE DO NOT HAVE SUFFICIENT
- 25 RECORDS TO KNOW WHO THOSE THIRD PARTIES ARE. WE

Page 7

- 1 ABOUT 12,000 IP NUMBERS THAT ARE OUT AT AN ISP THAT
- MAY WELL BE CONTROLLED BY MR. COHEN, BUT THERE ARE
- THIRD PARTIES THAT ARE OBTAINING SERVICES FROM THAT 3 4 ISP.
- 5 WE HAVE SAID ALL ALONG THAT CHANGING THE
- REGISTRATION AND PERHAPS SHUTTING THAT DOWN MAY NOT
- BE THE APPROPRIATE WAY AND WE WANTED TO MAKE SURE
- THAT THE COURT IS AWARE THAT THERE IS A POSSIBILITY
- 9 OF THREE PARTY HARM THAT PEOPLE COULD SUE ARIN, FOR
- 10 EXAMPLE, BECAUSE THE COURT DIDN'T ORDER THE, THE
- RESOURCES REVOKED. IT'S NOT CLEAR THAT WE HAVE THE
- 12 RIGHT TO REVOKE BASED ON THE COURT'S ORDER.
- 13 WE WOULD LIKE THE COURT'S ORDER TO BE
- 14 AMENDED TO SHOW THAT WE HAVE THE RIGHT TO REVOKE
- THOSE RESOURCES WHICH WE BELIEVE IS CONSISTENT WITH 15
- THE INTENT OF YOUR ORDER BUT WASN'T SPELLED OUT AND 16
- 17 IN PART BECAUSE WE WEREN'T A PARTY.
- 18 ARIN POTENTIALLY, BY THE WAY, COULD BE
- 19 HARMED IN EFFECT BY, BY THE INABILITY OF OURSELVES
- 20 TO, TO MAINTAIN THE UNIQUENESS OF THOSE IP NUMBERS.
- 21 SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF WE WERE TO REGISTER
- 22 THEM AS THE COURT ORDER SAID TO MR. KREMEN, HE
- 23 COULD BE BEGIN USING THOSE NUMBERS WHILE SOMEONE
- 24 ELSE IS USING THOSE NUMBERS. THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT
- OUR JOB IS TO PREVENT. IT'S TO GRANT UNIQUE,

- Page 9
- SIMPLY BELIEVE. AND WE KNOW MR. KREMEN HAS BEEN IN TOUCH WITH THOSE PEOPLE THAT CONTROL THE ISP FAR
- 3 MORE THAN WE HAVE BUT THE ISP HAS MADE
- REPRESENTATIONS TO US THAT THEY ARE THIRD PARTIES
- SO THEY WOULD BE HARMED. WE DON'T CARE SO AS LONG
  - AS THE COURT ORDERS US TO REVOKE THAT.
- 7 WE WANTED TO POINT OUT THE EQUITIES THAT
  - THERE ARE THIRD PARTIES INVOLVED BUT WE DON'T
- REALLY WANT TO STAND BETWEEN MR. KREMEN AND
- 10 MR. COHEN. WE NEVER WANTED TO BE THERE.
- 11 WE WANT TO GIVE THOSE RESOURCES, AS THE
- COURT WANTED US TO, TO HIM, BUT ONLY AFTER, AFTER
- HE SIGNS AN AGREEMENT THAT SAYS HE'LL USE THEM
- PROPERLY AND HE'LL BE GOVERNED BY THE RULES OF THE
- 15 COMMUNITY IN THE SAME WAY AS EVERYONE ELSE.
- 16 THE COURT: VERY WELL. LET ME INTERRUPT
- 17 WHATEVER COMMENTS YOU'RE GOING TO MAKE AND HEAR
- FROM YOUR OPPONENT.
- 19 MR. IDELL: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. I
- WANT TO START THIS DISCUSSION OFF BY APPROACHING IT
- IN A MUCH SIMPLER WAY. YOU KNOW, YOUR HONOR, IN
- THE FIVE YEARS OR SO THAT WE HAVE COME BEFORE YOU
- ON A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT PROPERTY ISSUES, THE ISSUE
- HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE SAME, THERE'S A JUDGMENT
- PROVIDES FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST OVER PROPERTY

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

- 1 THAT COHEN HAD. THIS ORDER IS NO DIFFERENT THAN
- 2 ANY OF THOSE.
- 3 IT'S NOT COMPLICATED. IT'S VERY SIMPLE.
- 4 IT'S UNDISPUTED THAT, THAT COHEN, SANDMAN, PACNET,
- 5 THE LATTER COMPANY BEING ONE THAT IT TOOK US A
- 6 WHILE TO FIGURE OUT HOW WE COULD PROVE THE ALTER
- 7 EGO STATUS BUT NOW HAS BEEN SHOWN THESE ARE ALL
- 8 COMPANIES THAT OBTAINED THESE RESOURCES FROM ARIN.
- 9 INTERESTINGLY, YOUR HONOR, THE STATEMENT
- 10 HAS BEEN MADE IN THE REPLY THAT KREMEN FOR THE
- 11 FIRST TIME IS COMING FORWARD AND SAYING HE'LL STEP
- 12 IN THE SHOES OF MR. COHEN. THAT'S NOT AT ALL TRUE.
- 13 WE HAVE BEEN SAYING THAT SINCE DAY ONE. WE SAID
- 14 THAT THE FIRST DAY WE CAME IN HERE ON
- 15 SEPTEMBER 17TH AND ASKED YOUR HONOR TO MAKE AN
- 16 ORDER THAT THEY REREGISTER THESE. THAT'S ALL WE
- 17 EVER ASKED FOR.
- 18 WE FILED OUR OPPOSITION TO THIS MOTION
- 19 AFTER, AFTER NOT ONE BUT TWO SUBPOENAS HAVE BEEN
- 20 ISSUED ON ARIN.
- 21 IN, IN NEITHER OF THE PRODUCTIONS THEY
- 22 NEVER PRODUCED IN RESPONSE TO THOSE SUBPOENAS THESE
- 23 CONTRACTS WHICH THEY GAVE US TWO DAYS AFTER WE
- 24 FILED OUR OPPOSITION. AND NOW THEY -- AND IT'S
- 25 VERY CURIOUS THAT THEY DIDN'T PRODUCE THOSE

- 1 THE COURT: THAT'S THE ISSUE I'M ASKING
- 2 ABOUT. THAT'S THE ISSUE I WANT TO KNOW ABOUT. IS
- 3 THERE A PLACE THAT I CAN LOOK TO FIND THE ANSWER TO

Page 12

Page 13

4 THAT?

5

12

- MR. IDELL: TO FIND THE ANSWER AS TO
- 6 WHETHER OR NOT MR. KREMEN WOULD SIGN AN AGREEMENT
- 7 IS THAT THE QUESTION?
- 8 THE COURT: SIGN WHATEVER AND INDICATED
- 9 IT NEEDED TO HAVE SIGNED IN ORDER TO, TO TRANSFER
- 10 TO MR. KREMEN WHAT, WHAT WAS ON ITS BOOKS BELONGING
- 11 TO MR. COHEN.
  - MR. IDELL: THEY HAD NEVER PRESENTED US
- 13 WITH ANY DOCUMENT WHICH THEY SAID THAT IF YOU SIGN
- 14 THIS DOCUMENT THEN, THEN YOU WILL BE IN THE SHOES
- 15 OF MR. COHEN.
- 16 HOWEVER, YOUR HONOR, THEY WOULD NEED TO
- 17 DO THAT BECAUSE IF THEY HAD VALID CONTRACTS WITH
- 18 MR. COHEN AND PACNET AND THESE OTHER COMPANIES THEN
- 19 BY REGISTERING THESE BLOCKED NUMBERS AND ASN
- 20 NUMBERS IN MR. KREMEN'S NAME, MR. KREMEN IS BOUND
- 21 BY WHATEVER CONTRACT COHEN IS BOUND BY.
- 22 THE COURT: AND HOW DOES ONE REGISTER?
- 23 MR. IDELL: THEY HAVE THE ABILITY, YOUR
- 24 HONOR, TO CHANGE THE RECORD OF WHO, OF WHO CONTROLS
- 25 THESE NET BLOCK NUMBERS AND AS NUMBERS. THEY DO

Page II

- 1 CONTRACTS BUT, BUT IT'S PERHAPS ANSWERED IN THE
- 2 FACT THAT THOSE CONTRACTS DON'T EVEN DESIGNATE WHAT
- 3 RESOURCES THEY APPLY TO.
- 4 BUT NOW WE KNOW THIS CONTRACT BECAUSE
- 5 THEY HAVE GIVEN THEM TO US AND THEY SAY THAT THESE
- 6 ARE CONTRACTS THAT APPLY IN SOME WAY. THEY SAY WE
- 7 CAN FIGURE OUT, IF YOU LOOK AT MR. -- IF I'M
- 8 PRONOUNCING HIS NAME CORRECTLY -- MR. ZLAK'S
- 9 DECLARATION HE SAYS WE CAN FIGURE OUT WHICH
- 10 RESOURCES WERE COVERED BY THIS CONTRACT. I CAN'T
- 11 FIGURE IT OUT. NO ONE ELSE FROM THIS LEGAL TEAM
- 12 CAN FIGURE IT OUT. IT'S NOT EVEN CLEAR FROM THE
- 13 DECLARATION.
- 14 THE COURT: LET'S GO BACK TO YOUR
- 15 STATEMENT ABOUT THAT THERE IS A CONFLICT, AS I
- 16 HEARD IT, BETWEEN THE POSITION OF ARIN AND THE
- 17 PLAINTIFF HERE OR, OR WITH RESPECT TO, WITH RESPECT
- 18 TO WHETHER OR NOT YOU HAD, YOU HAD INDICATED YOUR
- 19 WILLINGNESS TO SIGN WHATEVER THEY TENDERED TO YOU
- 20 TO SIGN FOR PURPOSES OF, OF TRANSFER. HOW DO I
- 21 RESOLVE THAT CONFLICT? IS THERE SOME DOCUMENT THAT
- 22 I CAN LOOK AT THAT WILL TELL ME WHETHER THE OFFER
- 23 WAS MADE AND REJECTED OR WHETHER IT WAS ACCEPTED?
- 24 MR. IDELL: YOUR HONOR, THAT'S A
- 25 DIFFERENT ISSUE. WHAT I SAID WAS --

- 1 THAT THROUGH AN ELECTRONIC PROCESS. IT'S VERY
- 2 SIMILAR TO WHAT HAPPENS IN THE DOMAIN NAME CONTEXT
- 3 IN TERMS OF MAKING AN ELECTRONIC ENTRY.
- 4 MR. RYAN STATED TO YOU IN HIS BRIEF
- 5 PRESENTATION THAT THEY HAVE TO TAKE THE RESOURCES
- 6 BACK AND REISSUE THEM. IT SOUNDS LIKE THEY'RE
- 7 DOING SOMETHING BUT THEY'RE NOT. ALL THEY'RE DOING
- 8 IS FLIPPING A SWITCH, AN ELECTRONIC SWITCH,
- 9 CHANGING A NAME FROM JONES TO SMITH. THAT'S ALL IT 10 IS.
- 11 MY POINT, YOUR HONOR, IS THAT THEY, THEY
- 12 HAVE BEEN IN AN EVOLVING PROCESS. THEY HAVE THIS
- 13 LONG HISTORY OF HOW THEY GOT THEIR POWERS, TO THE
- 14 EXTENT THAT THEY HAVE ANY, WHICH IS ANOTHER ISSUE
- 15 THAT WE CAN GET INTO INVOLVING THE OTHER MOTION.
- 16 BUT THERE'S A LONG HISTORY AS TO HOW THEY
- 17 GOT THEIR POWERS AND HOW THEY DEVELOPED THEIR
- 18 SYSTEMS AND ALONG THE WAY THERE WERE CERTAIN
- 19 RESOURCES THAT WERE ISSUED BEFORE THEY EVER CAME
- 20 INTO THE PICTURE WHICH ARE NOT REGULATED BY THESE
- 21 CONTRACTS. THAT'S THE SO CALLED LEGACY RESOURCES
- 22 WHICH APPARENTLY MR. COHEN HAS SOME OF THOSE.
- 23 THOSE ARE THE ONES THAT THEY SAY WE DON'T CONTROL.
- 24 THOSE ARE WITH UU NET.
- 25 BUT AS TO THE ONES THEY DO CONTROL

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

- 1 THEY'VE NOW COME FORWARD AND SAID, YES, THEY ARE
- 2 CONTRACTS AND WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THAT WE DON'T
- 3 HAVE TO SIGN ANYTHING, WE DON'T HAVE TO SIGN
- 4 ANYTHING NEW. WE JUST HAVE TO STEP INTO THE SHOES
- THAT COHEN HAD BUT WE WANT TO BE BOUND BY WHATEVER 5
- 6 COHEN WAS BOUND BY AND THEN THEY HAVE TO COME TO US
- 7 AND SAY HERE'S WHAT COHEN IS BOUND BY.
- 8 THAT'S NOT COMPLICATED AND IT DOESN'T
- 9 MODIFY THE ORDER AND, IN FACT, IT MIGHT INVOKE A
- CLARIFICATION THAT IN REREGISTERING KREMEN STEPS
- 11 INTO THE SHOES BUT THAT'S THE WHOLE NATURE OF
- 12 CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST. YOU WOULDN'T HAVE TO DO
- 13 ANYTHING MORE THAN THAT. THAT WOULD SOLVE THE
- 14 ISSUE.
- 15 THE COURT: I'M NOT SURE ON WHOSE SIDE
- 16 THIS CUTS BUT MY FIRST CONCERN IS THAT THIS IS A
- PROBLEM WHICH EXISTED FOR AS LONG AS IT DID WITHOUT
- 18 COMING BACK HERE AND ALERTING ME TO IT.
- I DON'T KEEP AS CLOSE A WATCH ON, ON MY 19
- 20 ORDERS AS, AS I WOULD WISH TO BECAUSE, BECAUSE IT'S
- 21 A BUSY COURT.

3

4

5

6

8

9

12

22

- 22 I DO RECALL HAVING, HAVING A SERIES OF,
- 23 OF PROPOSED ORDERS PRESENTED TO ME WITH RESPECT TO

1 OF HIS ASSETS TO BE SURRENDERED TO, TO MR. KREMEN.

SO IF THIS HAD BEEN PRESENTED TO ME AS A

HEARING WHAT I'M HEARING NOW, I GUESS I

I DO NOT WANT THE REGISTRAR HERE, ARIN,

10 TO DO ANYTHING OTHER THAN TO COMPLY WITH, WITH

11 WHATEVER THE LAW REQUIRES TO MAKE THE TRANSFER.

IT'S, IT'S BEEN THROUGH THIS CASE THAT I

15 I HAVE BEEN. IF THIS IS A DEED TO PROPERTY AND

18 PROCESS THAT HAS TO FOLLOW THAT. I WAS NOT

21 REQUIRED TO MAKE A PROPER TRANSFER.

19 INTENDING BY MY ORDER TO, TO EXCUSE EITHER SIDE

20 FROM HAVING TO GO THROUGH WHATEVER PROCESS IS

AND I WAS NOT INTENDING TO EXCUSE

24 IS REQUIRED BY THE REGISTRAR TO HAVE THESE NAMES

13 HAVE BEEN EDUCATED A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE NATURE OF

14 DOMAIN NAMES AND EVEN THIS IS EARLIER FOR THE COURT

17 THE PROPERTY BE TRANSFERRED, THERE'S A DOCUMENTARY

16 SOMEONE HAS SOMEHOW MISCONVEYED A DEED OR ORDERING

23 MR. KREMEN FROM SIGNING WHATEVER, WHATEVER DOCUMEN

25 AND TO COMPLY WITH THE LAW IF THAT'S WHAT EVERYBODY

NEED TO HEAR MORE FROM BOTH SIDES AS TO WHAT IT IS

2 AND, AND BECAUSE OFTEN THERE IS NO OPPOSITION.

PROBLEM EARLY ON, IT WOULD HAVE GIVEN ME AN

OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON IT.

YOU NEED THE COURT TO DO.

- MR. COHEN'S ACTIVITIES AND BEING WILLING, UNDER THE
- 25 CIRCUMSTANCES, TO, TO SIGN ORDERS REQUIRING VARIOUS

- Page 16
- 1 ELSE DID. I WAS NOT TRYING TO EXEMPT HIM FROM
- 2
- 3 NOTHING IN MY ORDER CONTAINS ANY KIND OF
- 4 EXEMPTION AND THE DETAIL OF MY ORDER IS MERELY A
- 5 REFLECTION OF WHAT I WAS ASKED FOR WITHOUT
- 6 OPPOSITION AND SO IF THERE HAD BEEN OPPOSITION
- EXPLAINING TO ME HOW TO SHAPE THE ORDER, I MIGHT
- HAVE SHAPED IT DIFFERENTLY.
- SO WHAT I SEE THE JOB BEFORE THE COURT
- 10 TODAY IS TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO DO THIS IN A WAY THAT
- 11 ACCOMPLISHES MY MAIN GOAL, NAMELY, TO HAVE MY ORDER
- 12 OBEYED; AND YOUR MAIN GOAL, WHICH IS TO GET THE
- 13 ASSET TRANSFER TO YOUR CLIENT; AND ARIN'S MAIN
- GOAL, WHICH IS TO HAVE IT TRANSFERRED IN A FASHION
- WHICH ALLOWS IT TO CARRY OUT ITS MANDATE TO HAVE IT
- ISSUED UNDER CERTAIN RULES AND REGULATIONS.
  - ALL OF THOSE I DON'T BELIEVE ARE IN ANY
- 18 WAY IRRECONCILABLE. AND SO WE CAN PULL ALL OF THIS
- 19 TOGETHER.

17

- 20 SO WHAT I NEED TO HEAR IS WHAT LANGUAGE
- 21 YOU ALL WOULD, WOULD SUGGEST TO ME WHICH, WHICH
- 22 CARRY THAT FORWARD AND IF YOU HEAR LANGUAGE FROM
- THEM OR THEY HEAR LANGUAGE FROM YOU THAT IS
- 24 INCONSISTENT WITH THAT, TELL ME WHAT IT IS AND I
- 25 CAN RESOLVE THAT CONFLICT. SO TAKE IT THAT WAY AND

Page 15

- 1 SEE WHERE WE COME OUT.
- MR. IDELL: AND THAT'S EXACTLY HOW WE ARE
- APPROACHING IT, YOUR HONOR. OUR SUGGESTION WOULD
- BE SIMPLE. OUR SUGGESTION WOULD BE THAT THE
- LANGUAGE WOULD BE THAT MR. KREMEN WOULD FOLLOW AND
- BE BOUND BY WHATEVER CONTRACTS EXISTED WITH COHEN
- AND HIS ENTITIES WITH RESPECT TO, TO THE NET BLOCK
- NUMBERS AND AS NUMBERS THAT ARE AT ISSUE.
- 9 THE COURT: FOLLOW AND BE BOUND BY. SO
- 10 YOU'RE QUESTIONING THAT HE NOT SIGN ANY DOCUMENT?
- MR. IDELL: WOULDN'T BE REQUIRED, YOUR 11
- 12 HONOR. NOT ONLY THAT, YOUR HONOR, WE COULDN'T
- RESOLVE THAT TODAY.
- 14 THE COURT: HOW DO I KNOW HE'S BOUND BY
- 15 IT?
- 16 MR. IDELL: WELL, YOUR HONOR, THEY'RE THE
- 17 ONES THAT ISSUED THE CONTRACTS AND IF YOU LOOK AT
- MR. ZLAK'S DECLARATION THERE ARE FIVE NUMBERS --
- 19 THE COURT: HOW WOULD I KNOW THAT
- 20 MR. KREMEN IS BOUND BY THE CONTRACT?
- 21 MR. IDELL: WELL, YOUR HONOR, HOW WOULD
- YOU KNOW THAT HE'S BOUND BY THE CONTRACT?
- MR. COHEN AND/OR HIS ENTITY SIGNED THE CONTRACTS.
- 24
- THE COURT: HOW DO I KNOW THAT MR. KREMEN
- 25 IS BOUND BY IT?

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

Page 17

Page 18 Page 20 MR. IDELL: BECAUSE HE WOULD BE TAKING 1 OPPOSITION, THEY NEVER ONCE CAME FORWARD AND SAID 2 THIS REGISTRATION SUBJECT TO THE ORDER WHICH WOULD SAID HERE ARE THE CONTRACTS THAT COHEN HAS, YOU'RE 3 SAY SO. 3 BOUND BY THIS. 4 THE COURT: HOW DO I KNOW THAT HE -- IF I 4 THE COURT: SO THE ONLY REASON THEY 5 CALL HIM IN AND I SAY YOU HAVE TO FOLLOW THIS 5 DIDN'T SIGN IS THAT BECAUSE HE DIDN'T COME FORWARD 6 ORDER, WHAT DO I HAVE TO PROVE THAT? WITH WHAT THEY --7 MR. IDELL: IF I MAY BY EXAMPLE, YOUR 7 MR. IDELL: THEY'RE ASKING HIM TO SIGN 8 HONOR GAVE AN ORDER AFTER TRIAL THAT MR. KREMEN BE WHAT THE CURRENT AGREEMENT IS. 8 9 ENTITLED TO THE PROPERTY IN SAN DIEGO. THE 9 THE COURT: THE REASON TO SIGN IS IT'S PROPERTY IN SAN DIEGO CARRIES WITH IT COVENANTS AND 10 CURRENT. YOU'RE WILLING TO SIGN SOMETHING BUT NOT 11 RESTRICTIONS, IT CARRIES WITH IT A HOMEOWNER'S 11 12 ASSOCIATION THAT YOU HAVE TO BE BOUND BY THE RULES 12 MR. IDELL: HE'S WILLING TO SIGN AN 13 ALL OF THAT FOLLOWS THE FORM. YOU GET THE PROPERTY 13 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT THIS IS THE COHEN CONTRACT, 14 AND THEN THERE ARE RULES AND REGULATIONS THAT 14 AND ONCE THEY PROVE TO US THAT, THAT THEY, IN FACT, 15 FOLLOW ITS USE. 15 HAVE A CONTRACT WITH COHEN AND IT APPLIES TO THESE 16 THE SAME IS TRUE OF THE PROPERTY THAT YOU 16 ASN NUMBERS WHAT I STARTED TO SAY A FEW MOMENTS 17 SIGNED OVER WITH REGARD TO THE FACILITY IN SAN AGO, YOUR HONOR, IS THAT WE CAN'T FIGURE OUT TODAY, DIEGO. YOU SAID MR. KREMEN IS ENTITLED TO THE 18 ABSENT SOME SHOWING BY THE OTHER SIDE, THAT, IN PROPERTY, THERE WAS A LEASE IN PLACE, THERE WERE 19 FACT, THESE CONTRACTS THAT THEY HAVE APPLY TO THESE 20 RULES AND REGULATIONS AND IT FOLLOWS THE FORM. 20 RESOURCES BECAUSE YOU CAN'T TRACE THEM. THEY DON'T 21 THE SAME THING IS TRUE WITH ALL OF THESE SAY ON THEM, THIS IS THE CONTRACT FOR THIS, FOR 22 DOMAINS THAT WERE SIGNED OVER. THIS NET BLOCK NUMBER OR THIS IS THE CONTRACT FOR 23 THE COURT: WELL, BUT, ALL RIGHT. SO 23 THIS AS NUMBER. 24 IT'S LIKE A COVENANT THAT RUNS WITH THE LAND SO 24 THE COURT: AND WHAT IS THE HARM TO 25 HE'S BOUND BY WHATEVER ARE THE CURRENT 25 MR. KREMEN IF THEY HAVE TO SIGN THE CURRENT Page 19 Page 21 RESTRICTIONS. 1 RESTRICTION? 2 MR. IDELL: NOT THE CURRENT RESTRICTIONS. 2 MR. IDELL: BECAUSE HE WOULD BE AGREEING 3 WHATEVER MR. COHEN WAS BOUND BY. TO MORE THAN COHEN AGREED TO AND THAT WOULD NOT BE 4 THE COURT: IF IT RUNS WITH THE LAND, AS CONSISTENT WITH THE JUDGMENT OF CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST. THE HOMEOWNER ASSOCIATION CHANGES THE RULES, IT HE SHOULDN'T BE REQUIRED TO HAVE LIMITATIONS THAT APPLIES TO EVERYONE. IF THE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION WERE NOT IMPOSED BY COHEN. 6 SAYS WE NOW CHANGED THE RULES AND YOU CAN'T HAVE 7 THE COURT: AND IS THAT THE ONLY REASON? EIGHT-FOOT FENCES AND SOMEONE TAKES THE PROPERTY. 8 MR. IDELL: THAT'S THE REASON, YOUR CAN THEY HAVE A SIX-FOOT FENCE OR ARE THEY 9 HONOR.

10 RESTRICTED TO EIGHT?

11 MR. IDELL: THE ANSWER IS AT THE TIME

12 THAT COHEN GOT IT FROM ARIN, IF THE AGREEMENT

13 PROVIDES THAT THEY CAN CHANGE THE RULES. THEN THEY 13

14 CAN CHANGE THE RULES. IF IT DOESN'T SAY THAT THEN

15 THEY CAN'T.

16 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO WHAT IS YOUR

17 OBJECTION TO HIS SIGNING? I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE

18 OBJECTION.

19 MR. IDELL: BECAUSE WHAT THEY PRESENTED

20 TO MR. COHEN, WITHOUT GOING INTO THE LENGTHY

21 PROCESS OF NEGOTIATION AND THERE IS AN ISSUE AS TO

22 WHY IT TOOK THEM SO LONG TO COME INTO THIS COURT.

23 BUT AT THE LENGTHY PROCESS THEY NEVER REPRESENTED

24 MR. KREMEN UNTIL THE REPLY TO THESE PROCEEDINGS

25 WHICH CAME AFTER OUR OPPOSITION AND SUPPLEMENTAL

10 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

LET ME GO BACK OVER HERE, AND I KNOW I'M

12 SHORT OF TIME OR OUT OF TIME.

WHAT IS IT YOU WANT THE COURT TO DO THAT

14 WOULD PROTECT YOUR CLIENT.

MR. RYAN: ABSOLUTELY. FIRST OF ALL, WE

HAVE GIVEN YOU A FORM OF ORDER THAT I WOULD LIKE

YOU TO REVIEW TODAY. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO SIGN THE

18 FORM OF ORDER TO MODIFY THE ORDER.

19 THE COURT: PASS IT UP.

MR. RYAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THIS IS

21 IDENTICAL TO THE ONE WITH OUR ORIGINAL PLEADING.

SECOND, I'M GOING TO HAND UP TO THE COURT

AN EXACT DUPLICATE OF THE RSA THAT WAS SIGNED BY

24 MR. COHEN FOR THE FIRST PIECE OF PROPERTY. NOW,

25 THE RSA'S CHANGE OVER TIME JUST LIKE SOFTWARE

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

11

- 1 LICENSES DO. WE DON'T CARE WHICH ONE HE SIGNS. HE
- 2 CAN SIGN THE ONE THAT WAS THE FIRST ONE THAT COHEN
- 3 AND HIS ASSOCIATE SIGNED. THEY CAN SIGN THE SECOND
- VERSION THAT WAS EXTANT ON SOME OF THE LATER GIVEN
- IP SOURCES OR THEY CAN SIGN TODAY. I, FRANKLY,
- 6 DON'T CARE.
- 7 THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU CARE?
- 8 MR. RYAN: I DON'T CARE BECAUSE WHILE
- 9 THE, WHILE THE, THE RSA HAS EVOLVED, THIS HAS BEEN
- TOTALLY OF THEIR MAKING THAT THEY WON'T SIGN
- 11 ANYTHING. THEY WON'T SIGN ANY PAPERWORK.
- 12 THE COURT: YOU'VE GOT ME NOW.
- 13 MR. RYAN: I UNDERSTAND.
- 14 THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU CARE?
- 15 MR. RYAN: I DO ACTUALLY.
- 16 THE COURT: IS IT SIGNIFICANT BETWEEN
- 17 THESE?
- 18 MR. RYAN: NO, IT IS SIGNIFICANT. AS THE
- 19 INTERNET COMMUNITY CHANGES, RSA 9, WHICH IS OUR
- 20 CURRENT VERSION, WOULD GOVERN ANYONE WHO CAME TO US
- 21 TODAY AND WE HAVE PROVIDED THE COURT WITH A COPY OF
- 22 RSA 9.
- 23 WE, WE REALLY JUST WANT TO RESOLVE THE
- 24 ISSUE. IT WOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE GIVEN THAT
- 25 THEY'RE GETTING THE RESOURCES TODAY TO SIGN RSA 9.

- Page 24
- 1 GRANTED THERE WAS A MAN NAMED JOHN POSTELLE WHO
- 2 INVENTED THE INTERNET AND HE HAD A NOTEBOOK ON HIS
- 3 DESK AND AT THE BEGINNING OF THE INTERNET HE WROTE
- DOWN SOME OF THOSE THINGS, MR. KREMEN GOT SOME OF
- 5 THAT SPACE, SO DID UU NET AND PART OF WHAT WE ASK
- TO BE TRANSFERRED IS THE UU NET AND THIS ORDER SAYS
- 7 WE CAN'T DO THAT AND IN THE SAME WAY I CAN'T TAKE
- BACK FROM MR. KREMEN HIS LEGACY ADDRESS SPACE, I
- SIMILARLY HAVE NO CONTRACTUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT
- AUTHORITY TO TAKE BACK THAT SMALL PORTION THAT UU 10
- 11 NET HAS. THEY CAN PURSUE UU NET FOR THAT.
- 12 NOW, THE LAST PORTION IN THE ORDER IS THE
- 13 ONE ASN THAT HAS BEEN TRANSFERRED IT WAS IN MEXICO.
- 14 WE TRANSFERRED IT IN 2002. THAT WAS PERFECTLY
- APPROPRIATE BECAUSE IT WAS ONLY IN DECEMBER OF
- 2003, NOT WHEN THE COURT ISSUED ITS ORIGINAL ORDER
- THAT THEY SOUGHT TO ENFORCE AGAINST US, THAT THEY
- SOUGHT TO HAVE THAT ORDER, AND I HAVE THE DOCUMENT
- RIGHT HERE TO SHOW THAT.
- 20 IT IS A LETTER SENT BY MR. IDELL. IT'S
- 21 DATED NOVEMBER 2003 AND IT SAYS THAT THEY'RE GOING
- 22 TO SEEK TO ENFORCE YOUR 2001 ORDER.
- 23 SO IN 2002, WE TRANSFERRED THINGS TO
- 24 MEXICO. THAT WAS PERFECTLY APPROPRIATE.
- 25 NOW, THERE'S TWO THINGS WE CAN DO. WE

Page 23

- THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE REGISTRANTS NOW
- WHO ARE AT VARIOUS STAGES OF PROTECTION OR
- 3 RESTRICTION?
- MR. RYAN: WE HAVE 11,500 DIFFERENT
- ENTITIES THAT HAVE GOTTEN RESOURCES OVER TIME THAT
- ARE GOVERNED HISTORICALLY BY THE DIFFERENT
- 7 AGREEMENTS.
- 8 THE COURT: SO THEY'RE USED TO THAT?
- 9 MR. RYAN: THEY'RE USED TO THAT.
- 10 THE COURT: SO WHAT DO YOU DO, LOOK UP
- 11 EACH ONE?
- 12 MR. RYAN: THAT'S RIGHT, THAT'S RIGHT.
- 13 AND SO IN TRUTH, YOUR HONOR, AGAIN, I'M TRYING TO
- 14 PROVE TO THE COURT THAT THE FLEXIBLE PARTY HERE;
- 15 THE PARTY THAT IS SEEKING RESOLUTION IS US, WHETHER
- 16 IT'S RSA 2, 3, OR 9, I DON'T CARE. IN FACT, I HAVE
- 17 A BLANK ONE SIGNED BY MY CFO RIGHT HERE IN COURT.
- 18 MR. KREMEN IS IN COURT. HE CAN SIGN IT RIGHT NOW.
- 19 AND I CAN LEAVE THE COURTROOM TODAY AND GO HOME AND 19
- 20 TRANSFER THESE RECOURSES.
- 21 NOW, THE OTHER COROLLARY THAT WE DO WANT
- 22 YOU TO ORDER THE REVOCATION OF THOSE RESOURCES.
- 23 THE COURT: I HEARD THAT.
- 24 MR. RYAN: ALL RIGHT. NOW, WITH REGARD
- 25 TO THE LEGACY PORTION, THAT PORTION THAT WAS

- 1 ARE AGAIN THE PARTY THAT WANTS TO RESOLVE THINGS. 2 I'LL GIVE THEM A NEW ASN, A NUMBER THAT IS A UNIQUE
- IDENTIFIER. IT WON'T BE THE ONE THAT COHEN HAD OR
- I'LL ASK MY BROTHER IN LATIN AMERICA TO SEE IF THEY
- WILL RETURN IT VOLUNTARILY TO THE COURT WHICH I CAN
- DO, BUT I CAN'T ORDER ZLAK TO DO ANYTHING. WE SPUN
- THAT OFF. 7
- 8 NOW, I AM OUTRAGED THAT MY BROTHER WOULD
- STAND HERE AND TELL THIS COURT THAT IT WAS ONLY IN
- 10 OUR REPLY PAPERS THAT WE, WE DESCRIBE THIS PROCESS.
- 11 I'M GOING TO READ TO THE COURT WHAT IS
- 12 EXHIBIT C.

15

- 13 THE COURT: DON'T READ IT. TELL ME AND
- 14 I'LL BELIEVE YOU AND I'LL LOOK AT IT.
  - MR. RYAN: LOOK AT EXHIBIT C TO
- MR. ZLAK'S AFFIDAVIT AND I CAN HAND UP A COPY
- BECAUSE I HAVE ANOTHER COPY HERE, AND IT WILL HELP
- 18 THE COURT.
  - THE COURT: I'VE GOT ENOUGH PAPER. LET
- 20 ME FIND IT. IT'S AN E-MAIL.
- 21 MR. RYAN: IT'S AN E-MAIL. IF YOU LOOK
- 22 AT THAT E-MAIL ON JANUARY 30TH, 2004, THIS IS
- 23 APPROXIMATELY 30 DAYS AFTER, AFTER MR. KREMEN
- 24 FINALLY DECIDED HE WANTED TO ENFORCE THE COURT'S
- 25 2001 ORDER. IF YOU READ THAT E-MAIL, THE ONLY

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

17

Page 26

- 1 IMPORT OF WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THAT WE ASKED HIM TO
- FILL OUT THE PAPERWORK, AND, IN FACT, YOUR HONOR.
- 3 THE COURT: WHERE IS THAT LANGUAGE?
- MR. RYAN: THIS IS MR. IDELL'S LANGUAGE.
- 5 AS WE DISCUSSED IN WASHINGTON, WE AGREED TO RESOLVE
- THE MATTER AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE ORDER BY
- ASSIGNMENT OF THE NET BLOCKS TO GARY, ARIN WANTED
- IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, ARIN WANTED GARY TO FILL
- OUT THE USUAL PAPERWORK BEFORE THE ACTUAL
- 10 ASSIGNMENT. IT WAS UNDERSTOOD THAT MR. JIMMERSON
- 11 AND YOU, IF NECESSARY, WOULD ASSIST GARY THROUGH
- 12 THAT PROCESS.
- 13 I CAN TELL YOUR HONOR, I WILL REPRESENT
- 14 TO THE COURT THAT I HAD MY STAFF PREPARE THE PAPERS
- 15 FOR THEM SO THAT THEY COULD JUST SIGN THEM.
- 16 SO SINCE 2004 ALL OF THE, ALL OF THE
- 17 ENERGY AND WASTE HAS BEEN GENERATED BECAUSE GARY
- 18 KREMEN WANTED DIFFERENT RIGHTS THAN EVERYBODY ELSE
- 19 IN THE INTERNET. HE WANTED DIFFERENT RIGHTS THAN
- 20 MR. COHEN HAD, HE WANTED DIFFERENT RIGHTS THAN THE
- 21 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AND WE WERE UNWILLING TO
- 22 GRANT THAT.
- 23 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I'M OUT ON TIME
- 24 ON THIS WHOLE MATTER SO I MOVE TO HAVE IT
- 25 SUBMITTED.

- 1 E-MAILS, AND THERE'S MANY OF THEM IN THERE, THOSE
  - WERE ALL SETTLEMENT DISCUSSIONS THAT PROBABLY
  - SHOULDN'T BE BEFORE THIS COURT BUT SUFFICE IT TO
  - SAY THAT THEY DIDN'T DISCLOSE TO US THAT THEY
  - DIDN'T CONTROL THE UU NET BLOCK, THEY DIDN'T
  - DISCLOSE TO US THAT THEY HAD GIVEN AWAY TO THEIR
  - LATIN AMERICAN BROTHER ONE OF THE BLOCKS, THAT THEY
  - ONLY HAD THREE BLOCKS.
  - THEY HANDED MR. KREMEN PAPERWORK WHICH
  - 10 WAS THEIR CURRENT PAPERWORK AND MR. KREMEN STARTED
  - 11 FILLING IT OUT AND SAYING, WAIT A MINUTE, I'M NOT
  - 12 APPLYING FOR THIS. I DON'T HAVE TO APPROVE THAT
  - 13 I'M DOING THIS. I DON'T HAVE TO DO THIS. ALL I'M
  - 14 GETTING IS WHAT COHEN HAD. AND WHEN WE TOLD THEM
  - 15 THAT, THEY NEVER SAID, WELL, COHEN SIGNED A
  - 16 CONTRACT, HERE IT IS. INSTEAD THEY DID NOTHING.
    - AND, AND, YOUR HONOR, WE HAVEN'T
  - 18 DISCUSSED THE, THE VARIOUS, THE VARIOUS PROCEDURAL
  - BLOCKS TO THEIR, TO THEIR RELIEF. WE HAVE BRIEFED
  - 20 THAT ALL EXTENSIVELY. I THINK THEY'RE OUT OF THE
  - 21 BOX ON ANY OF THE GROUNDS OF RULE 60 AND, AND I'M
  - 22 HAPPY TO SUBMIT IT, YOUR HONOR, BUT I WANTED TO
  - 23 MAKE SURE THAT WHILE THEY SAY WE'RE THE PARTY
  - 24 TRYING TO SOLVE THIS ALL MR. KREMEN HAS SAID SINCE
  - 25 THE HEARING IS EXACTLY WHAT YOUR HONOR SAID: I

Page 27

Page 29

Page 28

- 1 I'LL TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR PROPOSED ORDER.
- 2 IT, AS I SAID, IT DOES APPEAR TO ME THAT, THAT MY
- GOAL WAS SIMPLY TO, TO PUT MR. KREMEN IN OWNERSHIP
- OF THIS BLOCK OF RESOURCES AS A WAY OF, OF, OF
- 5 SATISFYING A JUDGMENT.
- 6 IT APPEARS TO ME TO TIE TO WHAT WAS TAKEN
- FROM HIM THAT MR. COHEN HAD DEVELOPED OVER TIME
- 8 UNLAWFULLY, AND BUT I WAS NOT TRYING TO EXEMPT HIM
- FROM NORMAL REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS SIGNING
- TO MAINTAIN THE RESOURCE AND IT WAS MY INTENT TO
- 12 HAVE HIM TAKE THE RIGHTS AND BUT ONLY UNDER THE
- 13 USUAL AND NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES AND I'LL TRY IMPOSE 13
- AN ORDER WHICH, WHICH TAKES, TAKES THAT INTO
- 15 CONSIDERATION.
- 16 MR. IDELL: MAY I BE HEARD BRIEFLY, YOUR
- 17 HONOR?
- 18 THE COURT: BRIEFLY.
- MR. IDELL: YOUR HONOR, WHAT I SAID WAS, 19
- 20 AND I DON'T SEE HOW MR. RYAN CAN DISAGREE WITH
- 21 THIS, WE NEVER FOUND OUT UNTIL AFTER THIS OUR
- 22 OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION THAT THE CONTRACTS WERE
- 23 FILED.
- 24 AND THE E-MAIL COUNSEL REFERRED YOU TO
- 25 SAYS NOTHING ABOUT CONTRACTS AND ALL OF THE

- WANT TO STEP INTO THE SHOES AND DO WHAT HE DID.
- NOTHING MORE, NOTHING LESS.
- 3 THE COURT: WELL, I'M SURE YOU'LL AGREE
- WITH THE COURT THAT I HAVE MADE THIS COURT AND, AND
- AVAILABLE TO YOU FOR ANY DISPUTE. IF I HAD KNOWN
- ABOUT IT EARLIER, IF THIS HAD BEEN STARTED IN 2004,
- IF I HAD KNOWN ABOUT IT IN 2004, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN
- RESOLVED IN 2004.
- NOW THAT I KNOW ABOUT IT, I'LL TRY AND 10 WHATEVER AGREEMENTS WOULD BE REQUIRED. THEY WERE 10 GIVE YOU A RESOLUTION THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH MY
  - ATTITUDE ABOUT THIS.
  - 12 MR. IDELL:. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
    - THE COURT: NOW -- SO LET'S MOVE TO THE,
  - 14 TO THE SECOND OF THE MOTIONS WHICH IS THE MOTION
  - 15 TO, TO DISMISS.
  - MR. HUMMEL: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
  - 17 CHAD HUMMEL ON BEHALF OF ARIN THE DEFENDANT IN THI
  - CASE AND THE MOVING PARTY.
  - 19 YOUR HONOR HAS ALREADY HIT ON A NUMBER OF
  - 20 THE THEMES THAT WE RAISED IN THE MOTION TO DISMISS.
  - THIS WAS A COMPLAINT THAT WAS BROUGHT THAT RELATES
  - 22 ENTIRELY TO THIS COURT'S SEPTEMBER 17TH, 2001
  - ORDER.
  - 24 THE COMPLAINT RECITES CLAIMS OR PURPORTS
  - 25 TO RECITE CLAIMS UNDER SECTION 1 OF THE SHERMAN

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

5

Page 30

- 1 ACT, SECTION 2 OF THE SHERMAN ACT, CALIFORNIA'S
- 2 CARTRIGHT ACT, WHICH IS THE CALIFORNIA STATE AND
- 3 ANTITRUST STATUTE THAT, OF COURSE, TRACKS ONLY THE
- SECTION 1 CLAIM AND THERE'S NO RIGHT TO UNILATERAL
- 5 MONOPOLIZATION CLAIM UNDER THE CARTRIGHT ACT. IT
- HAS TO BE CONCERTED ACTIVITY, CONVERSION AND BREACH
- 7 OF FIDUCIARY DUTY.
- 8 ALL OF THOSE CAUSES OF ACTION ARISE OUT
- 9 OF BASICALLY THE FOLLOWING CONDUCT NONE OF WHICH IS
- SUFFICIENT TO JUSTIFY THAT THE LAWSUIT CONTINUES
- 11 PAST TODAY.
- 12 THE CONDUCT THAT THEY ALLEGE IN THE
- 13 COMPLAINT IS, ONE, THAT ARIN WAS CREATED BY THE
- 14 GOVERNMENT; IT WAS CREATED TO ALLOCATE RESOURCES
- AND NOT PROPERTY BY THE WAY AND WE CAN GET INTO
- 16 THAT IF YOU'RE INTERESTED.
- 17 THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T KNOW. I MAY BE
- 18 BOUND BY THE CIRCUIT ON THAT.
- 19 MR. HUMMEL: THERE'S A BIG DIFFERENCE
- 20 BETWEEN DOMAIN NAMES AND IP RESOURCES AND MR. RYAN
- 21 CAN TALK TO YOU, AS HE DID WITH ME ALL MORNING
- BEFORE WE CAME TO COURT, ABOUT THE DIFFERENCES AND
- THEY'RE IMPORTANT BUT IT'S DIFFERENT THAN A DOMAIN
- NAME SUFFICE IT TO SAY THAT.
- 25 THE COURT: IS THERE A CASE HOLDING THAT

- 1 FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENCE IF, IF, IF MR. KREMEN,
- 2 KREMEN SIGNED THE CURRENT RSA AND OTHERWISE
- COMPLIED WITH ARIN'S GUIDELINES. THAT'S THE
- 4 CONDUCT. THAT'S THE CONDUCT.
  - SECTION 1 OF THE SHERMAN ACT AS YOUR
- 6 HONOR KNOWS ONLY PROHIBITS RESTRAINTS OF TRADE AND
- COMBINATIONS OR CONSPIRACIES THAT UNREASONABLY
- 8 RESTRAIN TRADE.
  - LET'S TALK ABOUT THE SECTION 1 CLAIM FOR
- 10 A MINUTE. IT IS, NUMBER ONE, BARRED BY STATUTE.
- 11 IT WAS A FOUR-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS. THE
- 12 CONDUCT THAT IS REALLY, REALLY BEING COMPLAINED
- 13 ABOUT BY MR. KREMEN OCCURRED THE DATE THE ORDER WAS
- SIGNED. HE COULD HAVE GONE TO ARIN THAT DAY AND
- 15 INSISTED UPON THE TRANSFER SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND
- CONDITIONS. IT'S MORE THAN FOUR YEARS BEFORE THE
- 17 FILING OF THE COMPLAINT. IT'S TIME BARRED.
- 18 NUMBER TWO, TO THE EXTENT HE'S
- 19 COMPLAINING ABOUT THE NEGOTIATIONS RELATING TO
- COMPLIANCE WITH THE ORDER, THAT'S UNDER THE 20
- 21 NORR-PENINGTON DOCTRINE AND WE CITED THE CASES THAT
- 22 TALK ABOUT SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS OR OFFERS TO
- COMPLY IN CONNECTION WITH ENFORCEMENT OF A COURT
- 24 ORDER.

7

25 NUMBER THREE, THERE'S NO COMBINATION OR

Page 31

Page 32

- 1 THAT'S A PROPERTY RIGHT?
- 2 MR. HUMMEL: NO, NOT OF THE IP TYPE THAT
- 3 ARIN DISTRIBUTES, NO. BUT WE WERE CREATED, WE
- ESTABLISHED PREREQUISITES FOR FOLKS AND COMPANIES
- THAT REQUESTED THESE IP RESOURCES. WE CREATED A
- REGISTRATION SERVICES AGREEMENT, VARIOUS FORMS OF
- WHICH YOUR HONOR HAS CONSIDERED AND TALKED ABOUT THIS MORNING. THOSE CONTAIN SOME SPECIFIC RIGHTS
- THAT ARIN RETAINS SUCH AS TO INSIST ON CERTAIN
- 10 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE, THE PAYMENT OF FEES, AND
- 11 WHAT THEY CALL GRAB BACK PROVISIONS, IN OTHER
- 12 WORDS, IF THEY VIOLATE THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS IN
- 13 WHICH THEY WERE ALLOCATED THE IP RESOURCES ARIN
- 14 OBTAIN THE RIGHT TO TAKE THEM BACK.
- 15 THE REST OF THE CONDUCT IS THAT THERE WAS
- 16 AN ORDER ISSUED, YOUR HONOR ISSUED IT IN SEPTEMBER
- 17 OF 2001, SERVICE OF THAT ORDER, BY THE WAY, WAS
- 18 AFFECTED IN DECEMBER OF '03. FROM DECEMBER '03 ON
- 19 THE PARTIES NEGOTIATED OVER THE COMPLIANCE WITH THE
- 20 ORDER AND THE TERMS OF SUCH COMPLIANCE, SOME OF
- 21 WHICH, SOME OF WHICH MR. RYAN GOT INTO INCLUDING
- 22 WITH THE E-MAIL.
- 23 AND IT'S UNDISPUTED THAT ARIN HAS ALWAYS.
- 24 ALWAYS ORDERED TO TRANSFER THESE IP RESOURCES, OR
- 25 IP RESOURCES GENERALLY, GENERALLY THAT WOULD BE THE 25 REQUIRES THAT THE ACQUISITION OR MAINTENANCE OF

- 1 CONSPIRACY THAT SURVIVES THE COPPERWELL TEST. THE
- BEST THEY CAN DO IS SAY THEY ARE OFFICERS AND
- DIRECTORS OF ARIN; THAT IF CONSPIRED WITH THE
- ENTITY ITSELF AND IF YOUR HONOR KNOWS UNDER THE
- COPPERWELL DOCTRINE THAT DOESN'T CONSTITUTE A
- SECTION I COMBINATION OR CONSPIRACY.
- NUMBER FOUR, THERE'S NO HARM TO
- 8 COMPETITION ALLEGED ANYWHERE IN THE COMPLAINT OTHER THAN THE CONCLUSORY LANGUAGE. MERELY HAVING AN
- 10 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT, MERELY
- 11 REQUIRING THAT PAYMENT OF FEES AND MERELY REQUIRING
- 12 THE SIGNING OF A REGISTRATION SERVICES AGREEMENT IS
- 13 NOT, IS NOT CONDUCT THAT HARMS COMPETITION IN
- 14 GENERAL, AND FOR THAT, YOUR HONOR, I WOULD REFER
- 15 YOU TO THE GREGORY CASE IN THE TENTH CIRCUIT WHICH
- 16 IS VERY ANALOGOUS TO THIS CASE UNDER THE SECTION I
- 17 OF THE SHERMAN ACT.
- 18 IN SHORT, THIS SECTION 1 CLAIM FAILS ON A
- 19 NUMBER OF GROUNDS, STATUTE, NORR-PENINGTON
- IMMUNITY, COPPERWELL AND THERE'S NO ALLEGATION
- 21 WHATSOEVER WITHIN THE RELEVANT MARKET THAT THEY
- DESCRIBE.
- 23 LET ME MOVE ONTO THE SECTION 2 CLAIM IF I
- 24 MIGHT. MONOPOLIZATION UNDER THE SHERMAN ACT

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

Page 37

## Page 34

- 1 MONOPOLY POWER, THAT IS THE ABILITY TO CONTROL
- 2 PRICE AND EXCLUDE COMPETITION THROUGH PREDATORY OR
- 3 EXCLUSIONARY CONDUCT. AGAIN, WHAT IS THE CONDUCT
- 4 HERE? THE CONDUCT IS MERELY HAVING LEGITIMATE
- SPECIFIC PREREQUISITES TO OBTAINING THESE IP
- RESOURCES AS A MATTER OF LAW THAT'S NOT
- 7 EXCLUSIONARY OR PREDATORY CONDUCT.
- 8 MORE IMPORTANTLY, HOWEVER, YOUR HONOR,
- THERE'S NO CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HAVING AN
- 10 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT AND THE PAYMENT
- 11 OF FEES REQUIREMENT OR, OR THE SIGNING OF A
- 12 REGISTRATION SERVICES AGREEMENT IN THE CONTRACTUAL
- 13 PROVISIONS WITH HOW ARIN ACHIEVED ITS POSITION IN
- 14 THE MARKET. THERE'S NO CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
- 15 THE TWO. IT DIDN'T GRANT IT THAT AUTHORITY, NOR
- 16 DOES IT ALLOW IT TO MAINTAIN THAT AUTHORITY.
- 17 THERE'S NO CAUSAL CONNECTION.
- 18 AND AGAIN, FOR THE SAME REASON THAT THE
- 19 SECTION I CLAIM FAILS ON STATUTORY GROUNDS,
- 20 STATUTORY LIMITATIONS GROUNDS AND, AND THE, THE
- 21 ENTIRE FAILURE OF, OF MR. KREMEN TO ALLEGE ANY HARM
- 22 TO COMPETITION, THE SECTION 2 CLAIM FAILS AS WELL.
- 23 YOUR HONOR, AS TO THE CONVERSION CLAIM I
- 24 THINK THAT'S BEEN ADEQUATELY BRIEFED. THERE'S NO
- 25 CONVERSION UNDER CALIFORNIA LAW AND UNDER THE

- 1 NO OBJECTION IS MADE TO THE TARDY SERVICE AND SORT
- 2 OF TARDY SERVICE IS WAIVED, AND THEN AT THAT POINT
- 3 IN 2003, YOU'RE TELLING ME DECEMBER 2003, THEY'RE
- 4 THEN TOLD WE'RE NOT GOING TO COMPLY WITH IT, WHY
- DOESN'T THAT START THE RUNNING OF THE STATUTE OF
- 6 LIMITATIONS?
  - MR. HUMMEL: NUMBER ONE, YOU HAVE TO
- STICK TO THE ALLEGATIONS OF THE COMPLAINT AND THEY
- ALLEGE IN NUMEROUS PLACES THAT WE CITE IN OUR BRIEF
- 10 THAT THE HARM OCCURRED AT THE MOMENT THE ORDER WAS
- 11 ISSUED.
- 12 NUMBER TWO, REGARDLESS, AND I CAN
- 13 ACTUALLY FIND THE PRECISE CITES IN THE COMPLAINT TO
- 14 WHERE THAT --
- 15 THE COURT: WELL, YOU'RE RIGHT IN TERMS
- 16 OF A MOTION TO DISMISS I NEED TO TAKE THOSE
- ALLEGATIONS AS TRUE.
- 18 IS THAT A FACT OR IS THAT A LEGAL
- 19 CONCLUSION THOUGH?
- 20 MR. HUMMEL: IT'S BOTH. I THINK IT'S
- 21 BOTH.
- 22 THE FACT IS THAT WHEN YOUR HONOR ISSUED
- 23 THE ORDER, YOU INTENDED TO, TO EFFECTUATE
- 24 ESSENTIALLY PUTTING MR. KREMEN IN THE SHOES OF
- 25 MR. COHEN WITH ALL OF THE RIGHTS AND ALL OF THE

- 1 FEDERAL CASES THAT INTERPRET CALIFORNIA LAW IF
- 2 THERE HASN'T BEEN NOTICE AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE
- HEARD IN CONNECTION WITH, WITH, IN CONNECTION WITH
- A COURT ORDER.
- 5 FINALLY UNDER THE BREACH OF FIDUCIARY
- DUTY CLAIM, WHICH IS ALSO TIME BARRED AS WELL AS
- THE CONVERSION CLAIM, THE BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY
- CLAIM FAILS SIMPLY BECAUSE THERE'S NO FIDUCIARY
- 9 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ARIN AND AN APPLICANT FOR IP
- 10 RESOURCES PERIOD. THERE'S NO FACTS ALLEGED THAT
- 11 WOULD SUPPORT THE EXISTENCE OF A DUTY UNDER
- 12 CALIFORNIA LAW AND THAT SHOULD FAIL.
- 13 THE COURT: COULD YOU SAY MORE UNDER
- 14 STATUTORY ANALYSIS. WHEN DOES THE STATUTE BEGIN TO
- 15
- 16 MR. HUMMEL: AT THE TIME THE COURT
- 17 ENTERED THE ORDER.
- 18 THE COURT: WHY?
- 19 MR. HUMMEL: BECAUSE THE COMPLAINT ITSELF
- 20 ALLEGATION IN STICKING TO THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE
- 21 COMPLAINT, THAT THAT'S THE TIME THAT THE HARM
- 22 OCCURRED THROUGH NONCOMPLIANCE.
- 23 THE COURT: WELL, BUT IF, IF MY ORDER IS
- 24 NOT SELF-EXECUTING IF, IF THEY CHOOSE TO, CHOOSE TO
- 25 DELAY SERVING THE ORDER AND IT'S AT THAT POINT THAT

- 1 OBLIGATIONS THAT MR. COHEN HAD.
- 2 WHEN THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN, THAT IS THE TIME
- THAT THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS BEGAN TO RUN, AND,
- FRANKLY, YOUR HONOR, THEY SHOULDN'T BE ABLE TO
- MANIPULATE THE STATUTE BY DELAYING SERVICE.
- 6 WHAT HAPPENED WAS THAT WE WEREN'T
- FORMALLY SERVED BUT WE RECEIVED NOTICE OF THE ORDER
- ALMOST IMMEDIATELY UPON ISSUANCE AND THESE
- NEGOTIATIONS AND THESE CONVERSATIONS INVOLVING
- 10 MR. RYAN BEGAN.
- 11 THE COURT: LET ME HEAR FROM YOUR
- 12 OPPONENT.
- 13 MR. KRONENBERGER: CARL KRONENBERGER FOR
- 14 GARY KREMEN. YOUR HONOR, WITH YOUR PERMISSION, I
- WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS
- 16 ISSUES, FIDUCIARY DUTY AND UNFAIR COMPETITION ISSUE
- 17 AND THEN HAVE MY COLLEAGUE TERRY HANLEY ADDRESS THE
- ANTITRUST ISSUES EXCEPT AS THEY RELATE TO STATUTE
- 19 OF LIMITATIONS.
  - THE COURT: I'M NOT SURE I'LL HAVE TIME
- 21 FOR ALL OF THAT BUT WHY DON'T YOU GET STARTED.
- 22 MR. KRONENBERGER: YOUR HONOR, I'D LIKE
- 23 TO ADDRESS A COMMENT THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS MADE
- 24 REGARDING, REGARDING THE ANTITRUST CASE IN GENERAL

AND THAT IS THAT IT HAS ARISEN OUT OF THE 2001

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

- 1 ORDER. THAT IS SIMPLY NOT THE CASE.
- 2 THE 2001 ORDER THEIR DISPUTE WITH IT
- RELATES TO, TO THE ARIN POLICIES AND WHETHER OR NOT
- 4 THEY'RE CONTRACTS AND THIS GETS INTO WHAT MR. IDELL
- WAS DISCUSSING ON WHETHER OR NOT THERE ARE ANY
- 6 CONTRACTS AND WHAT MR. KREMEN SHOULD BE OBLIGATED
- 7 TO.
- 8 THERE IS A SERIOUS QUESTION OF FACT
- 9 WHETHER ANY CONTRACTS EXIST THAT RELATE TO ANY OF
- 0 THE NET BLOCKS AT ISSUE IN THIS CASE.
- 11 WE DID NOT FIND OUT ABOUT ANY CONTRACTS
- 12 AT ALL UNTIL THE MORNING AFTER WE FILED OUR
- 13 OPPOSITION. ONCE WE GOT THESE CONTRACTS, THEY'RE
- 14 UNCLEAR ON WHETHER OR NOT THEY RELATE TO THE NET
- 15 BLOCKS AT ISSUE. THEY MAY NOT BE ANY CONTRACTS AT
- 16 ALL THAT RELATE TO THESE. IN FACT, THE OCEAN FUND
- 17 COMPANY, AN ALTER EGO OF COHEN, IT IS -- IT OWNS
- 18 THE ASN NUMBER, HOWEVER, THERE'S NO CONTRACT THAT
- 19 THEY PRESENTED.
- AND, AND THE BACKGROUND HERE, YOUR HONOR.
- 21 IS ARIN IS SORT OF IN A LONG HISTORY OF THE
- 22 LOCATION OF IP ADDRESSES. THERE ARE MANY
- 23 ADDRESSES, OTHERS THAT OWN THEIR OWN IP ADDRESSES
- 24 AND ARIN HAS NO AUTHORITY WHATSOEVER OVER THOSE.
- 25 WE SIMPLY DO NOT KNOW WHETHER THESE

- 1 SOMETHING STARTED IN 2001, SO IF THAT IS THE BASIS
  - 2 OF THE CLAIM, WHATEVER HAPPENED IN 2001, YOU'RE
    - TARDY.
  - 4 MR. KRONENBERGER: THE MOST IMPORTANT
  - 5 ISSUE, YOUR HONOR, THE MOST IMPORTANT POINT IN TIME

Page 40

- 6 IS THE SERVICE OF THE ORDER WHICH, WHICH, WHICH
- 7 IT'S EITHER LATE 2003, OR AS MR. ZLAK SAYS ON 2003
- OF HIS DECLARATION, THE FIRST TWO WEEKS OF 2004.
- WHAT HAPPENED BETWEEN THE ISSUANCE OF THE
- 10 ORDER AND ANY OTHER DATE THAT IS DIFFERENT.
- MR. KRONENBERGER: THERE WAS A
- 12 STIPULATION BETWEEN PACNET AND MR. KREMEN NOT TO
- 13 ENFORCE THE ORDER BECAUSE THEY WERE WORKING OUT
- 14 ISSUES REGARDING THEIR DISPUTE AND, AND ON -- AND
- 15 THERE'S A LETTER WHICH IS EXHIBIT L, I BELIEVE,
- 16 TO --

17

- THE COURT: HOW DOES THAT AFFECT ARIN?
- 18 MR. KRONENBERGER: IN A WAY IT DOESN'T.
- 19 YOU MAKE A GOOD POINT BUT THE REASON WHY IT WAS NOT
- 20 SERVED UPON ARIN IS BECAUSE, IS BECAUSE PACNET WAS
- 21 ON THE REGISTRATION OF THE NET BLOCKS AND, AND
- 22 MR. KREMEN HAD A DISPUTE WITH PACNET AND THERE WAS
- 23 A STIPULATION NOT TO ENFORCE THIS ORDER WHILE THEY
- 24 WORKED OUT THEIR DISPUTE. THEY DON'T WORK OUT
- 25 THEIR DISPUTE AND THEN ON EXHIBIT L YOU HAVE A

Page 39

- 1 BLOCKS ARE ARIN BLOCKS OR PRE-ARIN BLOCKS BECAUSE
- THEY ONLY CAME INTO EXISTENCE IN 1998.
- 3 YOUR HONOR, I'D LIKE TO JUMP INTO THE
- 4 STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ISSUE BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE
- 5 ENOUGH TIME HERE UNLESS YOU HAVE QUESTIONS.
  - THE COURT: WELL, YOU KNOW, I'M CONFUSED
- 7 ABOUT THIS WHOLE THING BECAUSE I NORMALLY, I KNOW
- 8 NOW AS A RESULT OF THESE PROCEEDINGS THAT A
- 9 NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION SUCH AS ARIN CAN BE SUED FOR
- 10 ANTITRUST BUT THIS IS NOT THE NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCE
- 11 THAT I CONFRONT IN THIS COURT AND I HAVE HAD
- 12 SEVERAL MAJOR ANTITRUST CASES WHERE THAT, WHERE
- 13 THAT LAW IS IN THE BALANCE.
- 14 THIS IS A CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH IS TOTALLY
- 15 ESCAPING ME AS TO HOW WHAT THEY DID, EVEN IF THEY,
- 16 THEY DID EVERYTHING THE COMPLAINT SAID AMOUNTS TO A
- 17 VIOLATION BUT LET'S STICK WITH THE STATUTE OF
- 18 LIMITATIONS.

6

- 19 IF I'M, IF I'M PROPERLY POINTING YOU IN
- 20 THE RIGHT DIRECTION, I'M TOLD THAT THE COMPLAINT
- 21 SAYS THAT THE HARM OCCURRED IN 2001. IS THAT WHAT
- 22 THE COMPLAINT SAYS?
- MR. KRONENBERGER: NO, YOUR HONOR, THE
- 24 COMPLAINT ALLEGES CONTINUOUS HARM STARTING IN 2001.
- 25 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET'S SAY

- Page 41
- 1 LETTER FROM MR. IDELL TO THE ATTORNEY FOR PACNET
- SAYING THAT WE'RE GOING TO PROCEED TO ENFORCE.
   THIS WAS NOVEMBER 6TH, 2003, A MONTH LATER THE
- 4 OPPER WAS SERVED SO DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE
- 4 ORDER WAS SERVED SO DECEMBER 2003, WHEREAS MR. ZLAR
- 5 SAYS JANUARY OF 2004, REGARDLESS, IT'S WITHIN THE
- 6 STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND THAT'S RELEVANT FOR UPON
- 7 CONVERSION.

8

- THE COURT: IT BEING WHAT?
- 9 MR. KRONENBERGER: THE SERVICE WHERE AN
- 10 ABSOLUTE DUTY.
- 11 THE COURT: THE SERVICE DOESN'T, THE
- 12 SERVICE DOESN'T AFFECT STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.
- 13 IT'S THE FILING OF THE COMPLAINT. SERVICE IS JUST
- 14 A PROCESS BY WHICH NOTICE IS GIVEN OF A COMPLAINT.
- 15 I HAVE TO JUDGE THE TOLLING OF THE STATUTE OF THE
- 16 FILING OF THE COMPLAINT, DON'T I?
- 17 MR. KRONENBERGER: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE
- 18 IMPORTANT THING IS THAT, IS THAT EACH TIME THE
- 19 PLAINTIFF IS INJURED OR EACH TIME THE PLAINTIFF'S
- 20 INTEREST IS INVADED THERE'S CONTINUING HARM AND THE
- 21 HARM IS, IS AND THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IS
- 22 CONTINUALLY RESTARTED WITH THIS CONTINUING HARM.
- 23 THE COURT: THERE IS SUCH A THING, AS I
- 24 WOULD RECOGNIZE, AND COURTS HAVE RECOGNIZED, AS, A
- 5 THAT A HARM THAT TAKES PLACE STARTING THE STATUTE

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

Page 42 Page 44 1 OF THE LIMITATIONS AND SO YOU'RE ABLE TO ATTACK ON 1 AT 2 SOMETHING NEW, THAT MIGHT EXTEND THE STATUTE OF 2 MR. KRONENBERGER: YOUR HONOR, THERE ARE 3 LIMITATIONS BUT IF THE HARM IS, IS, IS THE HOLDING TWO OTHER CASES THAT DEAL WITH ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF SOMETHING THAT REALLY BELONG TO THE OTHER AND 4 OF ILLEGAL AGREEMENTS, AIRLINE WELD, 742 F.2D 1194, 5 FOR THAT ENTIRE PERIOD OF TIME IT CONTINUES TO BE AND AURORA ENTERPRISES 688 --HELD, WHAT IS YOUR ARGUMENT THAT THAT ALLOWS YOU 6 THE COURT: AND IN WHAT SENSE IS THIS YOU TO HAVE AN ENDLESS STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS? CASE INVOLVE -- THEY SAY IN LAW SCHOOL ALWAYS STOP 8 MR. KRONENBERGER: YOUR HONOR, THERE'S AND GET THE QUESTION BUT YOU DON'T ALWAYS OBEY THA' 9 SPECIFIC CASE LAW THAT ADDRESSES IT AND WE WEREN'T STUFF ANYWAY SO. ABLE TO PUT THIS IN OUR DOCUMENTS BECAUSE IT WAS 10 IN WHAT SENSE DOES THIS CASE INVOLVE 11 ONLY BROUGHT UP IN THE REPLY OF ARIN. THEY BROUGHT 11 ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT? 12 UP A DOCTRINE DEALING WITH THE QUOTE, "LAST OVERT 12 MR. KRONENBERGER: THIS ENTIRE LINE OF 13 ACT" AND THAT FOCUSES ON NEW AND INDEPENDENT ACTS 13 CASES 14 THAT OCCUR AFTER AN INITIAL AGREEMENT THAT, THAT 14 THE COURT: THIS CASE. 15 THAT HAD HARMED FOR THE PURPOSE OF, OF CONTINUING 15 MR. KRONENBERGER: THE ARIN CASE, THE HARM IN THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS. AGREEMENT IS THE ARIN POLICY WHICH IS THE HEART OF 17 SPECIFICALLY THE COLUMBIA STEEL CASE, 111 THE ANTITRUST MATTER. IT'S THE ARIN POLICY OF 18 F.3D. 1427, IT GOES INTO THIS DISCUSSION WHERE REQUIRING THIS, THIS -- A GREAT AMOUNT OF 19 ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF A POLICY, JUST LIKE WE HAD IN INFORMATION BEING COLLECTED FROM PEOPLE WHO NEED I 20 ARIN, ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF A POLICY IS A NEW AND ADDRESS BLOCKS AND THEN, AND THEN BEING ABLE TO 21 INDEPENDENT ACT FOR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND THI\$ 21 SELECTIVELY AND UNDER THE PURE AND ABSOLUTE 22 WAS AN 18-YEAR AGREEMENT IN THE COLUMBIA STEEL 22 DISCRETION OF ARIN DECIDE WHO GETS ADDRESS BLOCKS 23 CASE, 18 YEARS BUT THE COURT JUST FOCUSSED ON 23 AND WHO DOESN'T AND THE --14 YEARS PRIOR TO THE FILING OF THE COMPLAINT. THE 24 THE COURT: DOES THAT HAPPEN HERE? 25 ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF THE POLICY WITHIN THAT 25 MR. KRONENBERGER: YES, YOUR HONOR. Page 43 1 FOUR YEARS WAS CONTINUING HARM WITHIN THE STATUTE 1 THERE'S A HUGE BUSINESS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES: THEY 2 OF LIMITATIONS. GET THE COMPANY AND THERE'S NO PROBLEM AT ALL BUT 3 SO THIS IS, THIS LINE OF CASE LAW SMALL BUSINESSES THEY WANT TO GET NET BLOCKS AND STARTING WITH COLUMBIA STEEL, HENNIGAN, 787 F.2D OBTAIN NET BLOCKS TO RUN THEIR BUSINESS AND IT'S A 5 1289 IS ANOTHER CASE AND IT DEALS WITH THE HUGE PROBLEM. THERE ARE HUGE DELAYS AND THE DELAYS AGREEMENT TO DIVERT CUSTOMERS OVER A LONG PERIOD OF ARE PUT IN PLACE BECAUSE THERE'S AN INCENTIVE FOR TIME JUST PRIOR TO THE FILING OF THE CASE WE'RE LARGE COMPANIES TO PROHIBIT SMALLER PLAYERS TO GET 8 ANALYZED. INTO THE MARKET BECAUSE SMALL COMPANIES LEASE IN 9 THE COURT: I'LL LOOK AT THAT. THAT IS A TURN IP BLOCKS FROM THE BIGGER COMPANIES IF THEY 10 CASE SIMILAR TO THIS WHERE THE DEFENDANT REFUSED TO 10 CAN'T GET THEM FROM ARIN. SO THERE'S AN INCENTIVE 11 DO SOMETHING AT THE VERY BEGINNING OF THE RUNNING 11 FOR LARGE TELECOMMUNICATION COMPANIES WHO CONTROL 12 OF THE STATUTE, CONTINUED TO REFUSE TO DO WHATEVER 12 ARIN AND THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND BOARD OF 13 IT WAS SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, LET'S TAKE THAT OFF, 13 ADVISORS, THERE'S AN INTEREST OF THOSE ADVISORS IN 14 JUST REFUSE TO TRANSFER, AND, AND THE COURT ALLOWED 14 PROHIBITING PLAYERS FROM ENTERING THE MARKET LIKE 15 AN 18-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS? 15 MR. KREMEN. 16 MR. KRONENBERGER: IN ESSENCE, YES. 16 SO AS YOU SEE, YOUR HONOR, WE'RE NOT 17 THE COURT: I'LL TAKE A LOOK AT THAT. IT 17 DEALING JUST WITH THE SEPTEMBER 2001 ORDER. 18 JUST SEEMS TO ME THAT WHAT THAT MEANS IS, IS THAT 18 THE COURT: NOW, LET ME ASK THIS, IF I WHEN YOU PUT SOMEONE ON NOTICE THAT THEY'RE HOLDING 19 FIND CONSISTENT WITH MY EARLIER DISCUSSION THAT SOMETHING, THERE IS NO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND I 20 IT'S LEGITIMATE FOR ARIN TO HAVE REQUIRED 21 JUST HAVEN'T SEEN ENOUGH CASE LAW TO CONVINCE ME OF 21 MR. KREMEN TO SIGN WHATEVER RESTRICTIONS IT IMPOSED

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

22 UPON REGISTRANTS, WHETHER THEY BE WHAT MR. COHEN

MR. KRONENBERGER: THE ANTITRUST CLAIM IS

23 HAD IN HIS POSSESSION OR AS REVISED LATER, IS THERE

24 ANYTHING TO YOUR ANTITRUST CLAIM?

25

22

23

25

24 CASE?

THAT, ESPECIALLY AN ANTITRUST CASE.

MR. KRONENBERGER: THAT WAS AN ANTITRUST

THE COURT: SO THAT'S WHAT I NEED TO LOOK

Page 46 Page 48 1 NOT AFFECTED IN ANY WAY. 1 NOW, IT'S BEEN OBSERVED BY THE U.S. 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO IT'S MERE SUPREME COURT. 3 EXISTENCE AND REQUIREMENT THAT YOU SIGN ANYTHING 3 THE COURT: NOW, LET ME SEE IF I FOLLOW 4 THAT IS AT THE HEART OF YOUR ANTITRUST CLAIM? THAT. I CAN HEAR A CLAIM, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, IF 5 MR. KRONENBERGER: THAT'S RIGHT, AND THE YOU CONVINCE ME THAT ARIN IS CONTROLLED BY A GROUP 6 SPECIFICS IN THEIR --OF LARGER COMPANIES WHO CONSPIRE TOGETHER TO KEEP 7 THE COURT: I STICK MY NECK OUT. DO YOU SMALLER COMPANIES FROM GETTING SOMETHING THAT WOULD 8 HAVE ANY CASE AUTHORITY TO FIND OUT THAT ARIN'S GIVE THEM ECONOMIC POWER. PRACTICED EXISTENCE IN WHAT IT REQUIRED PEOPLE TO 9 AND THAT WOULD BE THESE IP ADDRESSES AND 10 DO VIOLATED THE ANTITRUST LAW? 10 SO WHAT YOU'RE DESCRIBING FOR ME, ARIN IS NOT A MR. KRONENBERGER: IT'S CLEARLY 11 11 LEGITIMATE ENTERPRISE. IT'S A CONSPIRACY OF, OF 12 DISCRIMINATORY. 12 ITS BOARD TO, TO DENY SOMETHING TO, TO THE MARKET, 13 THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY CASE THE COMPETITION OF SMALLER COMPANIES OWNING IP 14 **AUTHORITY?** 14 ADDRESSES 15 MR. KRONENBERGER: ACTUALLY I WOULD LIKE 15 DO YOU TAKE THE SAME POSITION AS YOUR 16 PERMISSION. 16 OPPONENT WHICH IS THE ONE THAT I ASKED THAT IF ARIN 17 THE COURT: ANYONE BRING ME CASE 17 SAID TO, TO MR. KREMEN ALL WE WANT YOU TO DO IS 18 AUTHORITY THAT I CAN READ SOME OTHER JUDGE WHAT SIGN WHAT EVERYBODY ELSE HAS SIGNED, THAT THAT 19 YOU'RE ASKING ME TO DO. 19 WOULD STILL AMOUNT TO AN ANTITRUST VIOLATION? 20 MR. HANLEY: GOOD MORNING. TERRI HANLEY 20 MR. HANLEY: IT WOULD, YOUR HONOR. 21 FOR PLAINTIFF GARY KREMEN. I BELIEVE YOUR HONOR 21 THE COURT: I'VE GOT THAT. NOW, IS THERE 22 HAS GOTTEN TO THE HEART OF THE SUBSTANTIVE ATTACKS 22 ANY CASE LIKE THIS? 23 ON OUR ANTITRUST CLAIMS IN THIS MATTER. 23 MR. HANLEY: YES, YOUR HONOR. AND IN 24 NOW, YOU'VE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE CASE 24 FACT, IT'S A CASE CITED IN OPPOSING COUNSEL'S OWN 25 LAW ESTABLISHES THAT AN INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, AN 25 MOVING PAPER. Page 47 Page 49 1 AFFILIATE GROUP CAN BE LIABLE FOR ANTITRUST 1 THE COURT: GIVE ME THE CITE. ACTIVITIES. YOUR QUESTION IT SEEMS TO BE IS HOW 2 MR. HANLEY: U.S. V GRENELL WHICH IS HAS ARIN'S CONDUCT IN THE PRESENT CASE VIOLATED 3 ADDRESSED IN OUR OPPOSITION PAPERS ON PAGE 18. 4 THOSE LAWS? THERE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HELD THAT IS AN 5 THE COURT: THAT WAS AN EARLIER OUESTION UNLAWFUL MONOPOLY FOR AN ASSOCIATION TO EXCLUDE BY 6 BUT THE PENDING ONE IS GIVE ME SOMETHING THAT I CAN MEANS OF RESTRICTED ENTRY CONTRACTS INTO A READ THAT WILL HELP ME TO FOLLOW SOMEONE ELSE'S COMPETITIVE MARKET. THAT IS EXACTLY THE ACTIVITY LEAD. I LIKE WELL WORN PATHS. THEY USUALLY ARE THAT HAS BEEN CONDUCTED HERE ON THE PART OF ARIN AS SAFER SO. THEY HAVE IDENTIFIED OVER 11,000 TIMES AND, AND 10 MR. HANLEY: THE ANSWER, YOUR HONOR, IS 10 INCLUDING IN THE CASE OF MR. KREMEN BUT NOT LIMITED 11 THAT CONTRARY TO OPPOSING COUNSEL'S 11 TO THAT CASE. 12 CHARACTERIZATION OF THE COMPLAINT, IT IS NOT MERELY 12 THE COURT: HOW LONG HAS ARIN BEEN 13 THE ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICIES, MERELY THE 13 AROUND? 14 REQUIREMENT OF THE SUBMISSION OF DETAILED 1.4 MR. HANLEY: IT'S DEBATABLE AS TO WHETHER 15 INFORMATION BY APPLICANTS FOR IP ALLOCATIONS. IT'S STILL AROUND OR THEY EXIST NOW LEGALLY. THEY 16 THE HARM COMES AND HAS BEEN NOTED 16 CLAIM TO BE IN OPERATION I BELIEVE SINCE 1998. 17 PREVIOUSLY THAT, THAT A GROUP OF SELF-INTERESTED THE COURT: AND HAS THERE BEEN ANOTHER ECONOMIC INDUSTRY PARTICIPANTS TOOK IT UPON CASE INVOLVING ARIN HOLDING THAT IT IS VIOLATING 19 THEMSELVES TO LOBBY FOR AND CREATE THE PRIVATE 19 THE ANTITRUST LAWS OR HAS THE ISSUE COME UP? 20 INDUSTRY THAT IS NOW ARIN. 20 MR. HANLEY: TWO PENDING LAWSUITS 21 THE BOARD OF ARIN, WHICH IS SPECIFICALLY 21 INVOLVING ICAM, WHICH IS THE ORGANIZATION THAT WE 22 PLED AND IDENTIFIED IN THE COMPLAINT BY NAME, BY ALLEGE ARIN ATTEMPTS TO DERIVE ITS POWER. THE 23 INDUSTRY AFFILIATION, BY GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION. ACTUAL CONTRACT THAT WOULD EVEN, WOULD EVEN 24 CONTROL EXCLUSIVELY THE ENTRY INTO THE MARKET FOR 24 PLAUSIBLY LEGITIMIZE ARIN'S AT THIS POINT HAS BEEN IP NUMBERS, ALLOCATIONS AND THEIR USE. 25 YET TO BE EXECUTED. THERE IS NO EXISTING OPERATION

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

_		,	
	Page 50		Page 52
1	AGREEMENT AT THIS TIME THAT AUTHORIZES ARIN'S	1	THE COURT: YES.
2	POSITION IN THE MARKET AND THAT CREATES EVEN MORE	2	MR. HUMMEL: THERE WAS A CASE MANAGEMENT
3	OF THE, OF THE CAST, THE GREATER PALLOR OF THIS	3	CONFERENCE IN THIS MATTER TO SET FOR 10:00 O'CLOCK
4		4	DOES IT MAKE SENSE TO PUT THAT OVER?
5		1	THE COURT: YES, I'LL VACATE THAT AND
6	ICAM ITSELF IS SUBJECT TO TWO LAWSUITS CURRENTLY	6	I'LL ADDRESS WHAT THE CASE IS AND WE'LL BRING IT
7		7	ALL IN AND TALK ABOUT WHERE WE GO FROM THERE.
8		8	MR. HUMMEL: THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.
9		9	MR. IDELL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10		10	
11		11	(WHEREUPON, THE PROCEEDINGS IN THIS MATTER
12		12	WERE CONCLUDED.)
13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•
14		13	
15	The state of the s	14	
16	THE COURT OF THE POOR IT ELT TEE MORE	15	
ı	Quantity of the billion	16	·
•	LIMITATIONS AND, AND IF I GET PASSED THE STATUTE OF	17	•
18	- The second sec	18	
19	The value of the v	19	
20	,	20	
21	to, is significant in the labeled transfer in the labe	21	·
22	The state of the s	22	
1	ANTICOMPETITIVE.	23	•
24	22.00.000	24	
25	THE REGISTRY BUT THE PROCEDURES THAT ARE REQUIRED	25	
	Page 51		
1	TO OBTAIN THE REGISTRATION, NOT ONLY THE OBTAINMENT		
2	OF IT BUT THE MONITORING, THE GRAB BACK PROVISIONS		
3	THAT WE NOTICED NOT TO MENTION THE FACT THAT THE		
4	ENTIRE TIME FOLLOWING THE ALLOCATION YOU HAVE NOW		
5	PUT IN THE POSSESSION OF YOUR PRIMARY COMPETITORS		•
6	DETAILED, AND I MEAN VERY HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL		
7	INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR NETWORK OPERATIONS DOWN		
8	TO THE NAME OF THE LAPTOP THAT THE CFO OR CEO WOULD		
9	BE OPERATING ON. AND THE AMOUNT OF DETAIL IS		· .
10	AMAZING AND YOU HANDED IT OVER TO YOUR COMPETITORS		
11	WHO HAVE THE POWER TO TAKE IT OVER AT ANY POINT.		
12	THE COURT: IS THERE ANY EVIDENCE THAT		
13	YOU WOULD PROFFER TO THE COURT THAT IT HAS BEEN		
14	ABUSED?		
15	MR. HANLEY: WELL, AGAIN, WE'RE AT THE		
	PLEADING STAGE AT THIS POINT. OF COURSE WE PLAN TO		
17	CONDUCT DISCOVERY.		
18	THE COURT: YOU DON'T HAVE ANYTHING LIKE		
19	THAT AT THIS POINT.		
20			
	MR. HANLEY: NOT AT THIS POINT, YOUR		
	HONOR.		
22	THE COURT: VERY WELL. THANK YOU. I'LL		
23	The state of the s		
24			
25	MR. HUMMEL: YOUR HONOR, VERY BRIEFLY.		

14 (Pages 50 to 52)

	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
A	<b>AFFECT</b> 40:17	4:11 28:7	7:9,18 10:8,20	AVAILABLE 29:5
ABILITY 6:21	41:12	AMOUNT 44:18	11:16 15:9 19:12	AWARE 7:8
12:23 34:1	AFFIDAVIT 4:24	48:19 51:9	26:7,8 29:17	AWARE 7.0
ABLE 4:15 37:4	25:16	AMOUNTS 39:16	30:13 31:3,9,13	В
	AFFILIATE 47:1	ANALOGOUS	31:23 32:14 33:3	BACK 8:4,4 11:14
42:1,10 44:20	AFFILIATION	33:16	34:13 35:9 38:3	13:6 14:18 21:11
ABSENT 20:18	47:23	ANALYSIS 35:14	38:21,24 39:1,9	24:8,10 31:11,14
ABSOLUTE 41:10 44:21	AGO 20:17	ANALYZED 43:8	40:17,20 42:11,20	1 '
1	AGREE 29:3	AND/OR 17:23	44:15,16,17,22	BACKGROUND
ABSOLUTELY	AGREED 21:3	ANSWER 12:3,5	45:10,12,20 47:20	1
4:6 5:24 6:8 21:15	26:5	19:11 47:10	47:21 48:5,10,16	<b>BALANCE</b> 39:13
4	AGREEING 21:2	ANSWERED 11:1	49:8,12,18,22	BARRED 32:10,17
ABUSED 51:14 ACCEPTED 11:23	AGREEMENT 5:2	ANTICOMPETI	50:19,19	35:6
1	5:10 6:5,20,24	50:4,23	ARIN'S 16:13 32:3	BASED 4:21 6:23
ACCOMPANIED	9:13 12:6 19:12	ANTITRUST 30:3	46:8 47:3 49:24	7:12
3:9,16	20:8 24:9 31:6	37:18,24 39:10,12	50:1	BASICALLY 30:9
ACCOMPLISH	33:12 34:12 42:14	43:22,23 44:17	ARISEN 37:25	BASIS 6:7 40:1
16:11	42:22 43:6 44:11	45:24,25 46:4,10		BEGAN 37:3,10
ACHIEVED 34:13	44:16 50:1	46:23 47:1 48:19	ASKED 5:16,17	BEGINNING 24:3
ACKNOWLED	AGREEMENTS	49:19 50:12	6:4 10:15,17 16:5 26:1 48:16	43:11
46:24	23:7 27:10 44:4	ANYWAY 44:9	1	BEHALF 3:10
ACKNOWLED	AHEAD 4:10	APPARENTLY	ASKING 6:19 12:1	29:17
20:13	AIRLINE 44:4	13:22	20:7 46:19 50:11	BELIEVE 3:25
ACQUISITION	AL 1:5,9	APPEAR 27:2	ASN 12:19 20:16	4:21 6:16 7:15
33:25	<b>ALERTING</b> 14:18		24:13 25:2 38:18	9:1 16:17 25:14
<b>ACT</b> 30:1,1,2,5	ALLEGATION	APPEARANCES 1:23	ASSET 16:13	40:15 46:21 49:16
32:5 33:17,24	33:20 35:20	APPEARS 27:6	ASSETS 15:1	BELONG 42:4
42:13,21	ALLEGATIONS		ASSIGNMENT	BELONG 42:4 BELONGING
ACTION 30:8 50:4	36:8,17 50:19	APPLICANT 6:14	26:7,10	12:10
<b>ACTIVE</b> 42:19,20	ALLEGE 30:12	35:9 APPLICANTS	ASSIST 26:11	BEST 33:2
42:25 44:3,11	34:21 36:9 49:22	1	ASSOCIATE 22:3	BIG 30:19
ACTIVITIES 6:14	ALLEGED 33:8	47:15 <b>APPLIES</b> 19:6	ASSOCIATED	BIGGER 45:9
14:24 47:2	35:10	l i	8:16	BIT 15:13
ACTIVITY 30:6	ALLEGES 39:24	20:15	ASSOCIATION	BLANK 23:17
49:7		APPLY 11:3,6	18:12 19:5,6	BLOCK 12:25
ACTS 42:13	ALLOCATED	20:19	46:25 47:23 49:5	
ACTUAL 26:9	ALLOCATED	APPLYING 28:12	ATTACK 42:1	17:7 20:22 27:4
49:23	31:13	APPROACHING	ATTACKS 46:22	28:5
ADDITION 5:8	ALLOCATION	9:20 17:3	ATTEMPTS 49:22	BLOCKED 12:19
ADDRESS 3:24	51:4	APPROPRIATE	ATTITUDE 29:11	BLOCKS 4:17
4:1 24:8 37:15,17	ALLOCATIONS	6:16 7:7 22:24	50:11	26:7 28:7,8,19
37:23 44:20,22	47:15,25	24:15,24	ATTORNEY 41:1	38:10,15 39:1,1,1
52:6	ALLOW 34:16	APPROPRIATE	AURORA 44:5	40:21 44:20,22
ADDRESSED 49:3	ALLOWED 43:14	4:17	AUTHORITATI	45:3,4,9
ADDRESSES 4:13	ALLOWS 16:15	APPROVE 28:12	8:10	BOARD 45:12,12
38:22,23,23 42:9	42:6	APPROXIMAT	AUTHORITY	47:21 48:12
48:9,14	ALTER 10:6 38:17	25:23	24:10 34:15,16	BOOKS 12:10
ADEQUATELY	AMAZING 51:10	<b>AREA</b> 50:9	38:24 46:8,14,18	BOUND 12:20,21
34:24	AMENDED 7:14	ARGUING 3:23	50:5	14:5,6,7 17:6,9,14
ADVISORS 45:13	AMERICA 25:4	ARGUMENT 42:6	AUTHORIZES	17:20,22,25 18:12
45:13	AMERICAN 3:6	<b>ARIN</b> 3:10 4:25 5:1	50:1	18:25 19:3 20:3
	1			

				<del> </del>
30:18	46:13,17,24 47:3	CLEARLY 46:11	51:5,10	CONSIDERATI
BOX 28:21	48:22,24 49:10,11	CLERK 3:5	COMPLAINED	27:15
BREACH 30:6	49:18 50:12 52:2	<b>CLIENT</b> 16:13	32:12	CONSIDERED
35:5,7	52:6	21:14	COMPLAINING	31:7
BRIEF 13:4 36:9	CASES 32:21 35:1	CLIENT'S 3:20	32:19	CONSISTENT
<b>BRIEFED</b> 28:19	39:12 44:3,13	<b>CLOSE</b> 14:19	COMPLAINT	7:15 21:4 29:10
34:24	CAST 50:3	COHEN 4:18,24	29:21,24 30:13	45:19
BRIEFLY 27:16	CAUSAL 34:9,14	7:2 8:16,16 9:10	32:17 33:8 35:19	CONSPIRACIES
27:18 51:25	34:17	10:1,4,12 12:11	35:21 36:8,13	32:7
BRING 8:4 46:17	CAUSES 30:8	12:15,18,21 13:22		CONSPIRACY
52:6	CEO 51:8	14:5,6,7 17:6,23	41:13,14,16 42:24	33:1,6 48:11
<b>BROTHER</b> 25:4,8	CERTAIN 13:18	19:3,12,20 20:2	47:12,22	CONSPIRE 48:6
28:7	16:16 31:9	20:13,15 21:3,6	COMPLIANCE	CONSPIRED 33:3
BROUGHT 29:21	CERTIFICATE	21:24 22:2 25:3	31:19,20 32:20	CONSTITUTE
42:11,11	1:25	26:20 27:7 28:14	COMPLICATED	33:5
BUSINESS 5:19	CFO 23:17 51:8	28:15 36:25 37:1	10:3 14:8	CONSTRUCTIVE
8:18,19 45:1,4	CHAD 2:7 29:17	38:17 45:22	COMPLIED 32:3	9:25 14:12 21:4
BUSINESSES 45:1	CHANGE 3:11 4:4	COHEN'S 14:24	COMPLY 6:13	CONTAIN 31:8
45:3	5:12 6:12 12:24	COLLEAGUE	15:10,25 32:23	CONTAINS 16:3
BUSY 14:21	19:13,14 21:25	3:17 37:17	36:4	CONTEXT 13:2
	CHANGED 19:7	COLLECTED	CONCERN 14:16	CONTINUALLY
C	CHANGES 19:5	44:19	CONCERTED	41:22
C 1:15 2:1 3:2	22:19	COLUMBIA 42:17	30:6	CONTINUED 1:23
25:12,15	CHANGING 7:5	42:22 43:4	CONCLUDED	43:12
CALIFORNIA 1:2	13:9	COMBINATION	52:11	CONTINUES
1:18,20,21 2:4 3:1	CHARACTERI	32:25 33:6	CONCLUSION	30:10 42:5
30:2 34:25 35:1	47:12	COMBINATIONS	36:19	CONTINUING
35:12	CHOOSE 35:24,24	32:7	CONCLUSORY	41:20,22 42:15
CALIFORNIA'S	CHOSE 6:22	COME 8:13 9:22	33:9	43:1
30:1	CIRCUIT 30:18	14:1,6 17:1 19:22	CONDITIONS	CONTINUOUS
CALL 18:5 31:11	33:15	20:5 49:19	31:12 32:16 43:13	39:24
CALLED 13:21	CIRCUMSTAN	COMES 47:16	CONDUCT 30:9	CONTRACT 11:4
CALLING 3:5	39:10,14	COMING 10:11	30:12 31:15 32:4	11:10 12:21 17:20
<b>CARE</b> 9:5 22:1,6,7	CIRCUMSTAN	14:18	32:4,12 33:13	17:22 20:13,15,21
22:8,14 23:16	14:25 27:13	COMMENT 15:5	34:3,3,4,7 47:3	20:22 28:16 38:18
CAREFULLY	<b>CITE</b> 36:9 49:1	37:23	51:17	49:23
50:16	CITED 32:21	COMMENTS 9:17	CONDUCTED	CONTRACTS
CARL 37:13	48:24	COMMUNITY 6:8	49:8	10:23 11:1,2,6
CARRIES 18:10	<b>CITES</b> 36:13	6:18 9:15 22:19	CONFERENCE	12:17 13:21 14:2
18:11	CLAIM 30:4,5	COMPANIES 10:8	52:3	17:6,17,23 20:2
CARRY 16:15,22	32:9 33:18,23	12:18 31:4 45:7,8	CONFIDENTIAL	20:19 27:22,25
CARTRIGHT	34:19,22,23 35:6	45:9,11 48:6,7,13	51:6	38:4,6,9,11,13,15
30:2,5	35:7,8 40:2 45:24	COMPANY 10:5	CONFLICT 8:7,8	49:6
CASE 1:11 3:5	45:25 46:4 48:4	38:17 45:2	11:15,21 16:25	CONTRACTUAL
15:12 29:18 30:25	49:16 50:4	COMPETITION	CONFRONT	24:9 34:12
33:15,16 37:24	CLAIMS 29:24,25	33:8,13 34:2,22	39:11	CONTRACTUA
38:1,10 42:9,17	46:23	37:16 48:13	CONFUSED 39:6	6:23
42:23 43:3,5,7,10	CLARIFICATI	COMPETITIVE	CONNECTION	CONTRARY
43:21,22,24 44:7	14:10	49:7	32:23 34:17 35:3	47:11
44:10,14,15 46:8	CLEAR 7:11 11:12	COMPETITORS	35:3	CONTROL 9:2
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	CHERRY 1.11 11.12	COMETITORS	ر.ر	COLLINOL 7.2

13:23,25 28:5	41:8,11,23 42:23	DEBATABLE	DIRECTION	21:23
34:1 45:11 47:24	43:9,14,17,25	49:14	39:20	<b>DUTY</b> 6:20 30:7
CONTROLLED	44:6,14,24 45:18	DECEMBER	DIRECTORS 33:3	35:6,7,11 37:16
7:2 48:5	46:2,7,13,17 47:5	24:15 31:18,18	45:12	41:10
CONTROLS 12:24	48:2,3,21 49:1,4	36:3 41:4	DIRECTORY 8:9	D.C 2:9
CONT'D 2:1	49:12,17 50:8	<b>DECIDE</b> 44:22	DISAGREE 27:20	<b>D.</b> C 2.7
CONVENED 3:3	51:12,13,18,22	DECIDED 25:24	DISCLOSE 28:4,6	E
CONVERSATI	52:1,5	DECLARATION	DISCLOSURE	E 1:15,15 2:1,1 3:2
37:9	COURTROOM	11:9,13 17:18	31:10 33:10 34:10	3:2
CONVERSION	23:19	40:8	DISCOVERY	EARLIER 15:14
30:6 34:23,25	COURTS 41:24	<b>DEED</b> 15:15,16	51:17	29:6 45:19 47:5
35:7 41:7	COURT'S 4:20	DEFENDANT	DISCRETION	<b>EARLY</b> 15:4
CONVINCE 43:21	7:12,13 25:24	3:10 29:17 37:23	44:22	ECONOMIC
48:5	29:22	43:10	DISCRIMINAT	47:18 48:8
COPPERWELL	COVENANT	DEFENDANTS	46:12	EDUCATED 15:13
33:1,5,20	18:24	1:10 2:6	DISCUSSED 26:5	EFFECT 7:19
COPY 22:21 25:16	COVENANTS	DEFENSE 6:1	28:18	EFFECTUATE
25:17	18:10	26:21	DISCUSSING 38:5	36:23
CORNERS 35:20	COVERED 11:10	DELAY 35:25	DISCUSSION 9:20	EGO 10:7 38:17
COROLLARY	CREATE 47:19	DELAYING 37:5	42:18 45:19	EIGHT 19:10
23:21	CREATED 30:13	DELAYS 45:5,5	DISCUSSIONS	EIGHT-FOOT
CORRECTLY	30:14 31:3,5	DENY 48:12	28:2	19:8
11:8	CREATES 50:2	DEPARTMENT	<b>DISMISS</b> 3:20,23	EITHER 5:5,6
COUNSEL 27:24	CRR 1:25	6:1,2 26:21	29:15,20 36:16	15:19 40:7
COUNSEL'S	CSR 1:25	<b>DERIVE</b> 49:22	<b>DISPUTE</b> 29:5	ELECTRONIC
47:11 48:24	CURIOUS 10:25	DESCRIBE 25:10	38:2 40:14,22,24	13:1,3,8
COURSE 4:7 30:3	CURRENT 18:25	33:22	40:25	ELSE'S 47:7
51:16	19:2 20:8,10,25	DESCRIBING	DISTRIBUTES	EMERGENCY 4:6
<b>COURT</b> 1:1,25 3:3	22:20 28:10 32:2	48:10	31:3	ENDLESS 42:7
3:12,19,22 4:2,8	CURRENTLY	DESIGNATE 11:2	DISTRICT 1:1,2	<b>ENERGY</b> 26:17
4:10 5:5,11,16	50:6	DESK 24:3	1:13	ENFORCE 24:17
6:11 7:8,10,22 8:6	CUSTOMERS	<b>DETAIL</b> 16:4 51:9	<b>DIVERT</b> 43:6	24:22 25:24 40:13
8:12,21 9:6,12,16	43:6	DETAILED 47:14	DIVISION 1:3	40:23 41:2
11:14 12:1,8,22	CUTS 14:16	51:6	DOCTRINE 32:21	ENFORCEMENT
14:15,21 15:8,14	C-06-25543:5	DEVELOPED	33:5 42:12	26:6 32:23 42:19
16:9 17:9,14,19	C-06-2554-JW 1:5	13:17 27:7	DOCUMENT	42:20,25 44:3,11
17:24 18:4,23	C-98-20718-JW	<b>DIEGO</b> 2:4 18:9,10	11:21 12:13,14	ENJOY 50:5
19:4,16,22 20:4,9	1:5	18:18	15:23 17:10 24:18	ENTERED 35:17
20:24 21:7,10,13		DIFFERENCE	DOCUMENTARY	ENTERING 45:14
21:19,22 22:7,12	D	30:19	15:17	ENTERPRISE
22:14,16,21 23:1	<b>D</b> 3:2	DIFFERENCES	DOCUMENTS	48:11
23:8,10,14,17,18	<b>DATE</b> 32:13 40:10	30:22	42:10	ENTERPRISES
23:23 24:16 25:5	<b>DATED</b> 24:21	DIFFERENT 9:23	<b>DOING</b> 6:10 13:7	44:5
25:9,11,13,18,19	DAY 10:13,14	10:1 11:25 23:4,6	13:7 28:13	<b>ENTIRE</b> 34:21
26:3,14,23 27:18	32:14	26:18,19,20 30:23	DOMAIN 13:2	42:5 44:12 51:4
28:3 29:3,4,4,13	DAYS 10:23 25:23	40:10	15:14 30:20,23	51:23
30:17,22,25 32:23	<b>DEAL</b> 6:17,24 44:3	DIFFERENTLY	DOMAINS 18:22	ENTIRELY 29:22
35:4,13,16,18,23	<b>DEALING</b> 42:12	16:8	DONATIONS 4:25	ENTITIES 17:7
36:15 37:11,20	45:17	DILLON 2:2,3	<b>DRIVE</b> 2:3	23:5
39:6,11,25 40:17	<b>DEALS</b> 43:5	3:18	DUPLICATE	ENTITLED 8:2,3
37.0,11,23 70.17		3.10	DULLICATE	
L	•	•	The state of the s	

<u> </u>				
18:9,18	17:6	41:13,16 42:24	$G_{3:2}$	GREGORY 33:15
<b>ENTITY</b> 8:16	EXISTENCE	43:7	GARY 1:5 3:6,16	GRENELL 49:2
17:23 33:4	35:11 39:2 46:3,9	FILL 26:2,8	26:7,8,11,17	GROUNDS 28:21
ENTRY 13:3 47:24	50:19,24	FILLING 28:11	37:14 46:21	33:19 34:19,20
49:6	<b>EXISTING</b> 49:25	FINALLY 25:24	GENERAL 33:14	GROUP 47:1,17
EQUITIES 9:7	EXPLAINING	35:5	37:24	48:5
EQUIVALENCE	16:7	FIND 12:3,5 25:20	GENERALLY	GUESS 15:6
32:1	EXTANT 22:4	36:13 38:11 45:19		GUIDELINES
ESCAPING 39:15	EXTEND 42:2	46:8 50:13	GENERATED	32:3
ESPECIALLY	EXTENSIVELY	FIRM 3:9	26:17	32.3
43:22	28:20	FIRST 4:1,4 10:11	GERARDI 2:2	Н
ESSENCE 5:19	EXTENT 13:14	10:14 14:16 21:15	GETTING 22:25	HAND 21:22 25:16
6:12 43:16	32:18	21:24 22:2 40:8	28:14 48:7	HANDED 28:9
ESSENTIALLY	E-MAIL 25:20,21	FIVE 9:22 17:18	GIVE 4:16 5:19,23	51:10
4:12 36:24	25:22,25 27:24	FLEXIBLE 23:14	6:17 9:11 25:2	HANLEY 1:16,17
ESTABLISHED	31:22	FLIPPING 13:8	29:10 47:6 48:8	3:17 37:17 46:20
31:4	E-MAILS 28:1	FOCUSES 42:13	49:1 51:24	46:20 47:10 48:20
ESTABLISHES		FOCUSSED 42:23	GIVEN 11:5 15:4	48:23 49:2,14,20
46:25	F	FOLKS 31:4	21:16 22:4,24	50:24 51:15,20
ESTABLISHME	FACILITY 18:17	FOLLOW 15:18	28:6 41:14	HAPPEN 37:2
47:13	FACT 11:2 14:9	17:5,9 18:5,15	GIVES 6:7	44:24
ET 1:5,8	20:14,19 23:16	47:7 48:3	GIVING 8:21	HAPPENED 37:6
EVERYBODY 5:1	26:2 36:18,22	FOLLOWING 3:4	GO 4:10,13 11:14	40:2,9
15:25 26:18 48:18	38:8,16 48:24	30:9 51:4	15:20 21:11 23:19	HAPPENS 13:2
EVIDENCE 51:12	51:3	<b>FOLLOWS</b> 18:13	52:7	HAPPY 28:22
EVOLVED 22:9	FACTS 35:10	18:20	GOAL 16:11,12,14	HARM 7:9 20:24
EVOLVING 13:12	<b>FAIL</b> 35:12	FORM 18:13,20	27:3	33:7 34:21 35:21
<b>EX</b> 4:5 5:17,22	<b>FAILS</b> 33:18 34:19	21:16,18	GOES 42:18	36:10 39:21,24
EXACT 21:23	34:22 35:8	FORMALLY 37:7	GOING 9:17 19:20	41:20,21,22,25
EXACTLY 7:24	FAILURE 34:21	FORMS 31:6	21:22 24:21 25:11	42:3,16 43:1
8:23 17:2 28:25	FALL 4:1	FORWARD 10:11	36:4 41:2	47:16
49:7	FALSE 4:22 5:7	14:1 16:22 20:1,5	GOOD 3:12,13,14	HARMED 7:19 9:5
EXAMPLE 4:15	FAR 9:2	FOUND 27:21	3:15 9:19 29:16	42:15
7:10,21 18:7	FASCINATING	<b>FOUR</b> 32:16 33:7	40:19 46:20	HARMS 33:13
EXCLUDE 34:2	50:8	35:20 43:1	GOTTEN 23:5	HEAR 9:17 15:7
49:5	FASHION 4:5	FOUR-YEAR	46:22	16:20,22,23 37:11
EXCLUSIONARY	16:14	32:11	<b>GOVERN</b> 22:20	48:4
34:3,7	FEDERAL 35:1	FRANCISCO 1:18	GOVERNED 9:14	HEARD 11:16
EXCLUSIVELY	FEES 31:10 33:11	1:21	23:6	23:23 27:16 35:3
47:24	34:11	FRANKLY 22:5	GOVERNMENT	<b>HEARING</b> 15:6,6
<b>EXCUSE</b> 15:19,22	<b>FENCE</b> 19:9	37:4	30:14 47:23	28:25
EXECUTED 49:25	FENCES 19:8	<b>FULLY</b> 5:22	GOVERNMEN	<b>HEART</b> 44:16 46:4
EXEMPT 16:1	FIDUCIARY 30:7	FUNCTIONAL	50:5	46:22 50:10
27:8	35:5,7,8 37:16	32:1	GRAB 31:11 51:2	<b>HELD</b> 1:12 3:4
EXEMPTION	FIGURE 10:6 11:7	FUND 1:8 38:16	GRANT 7:25 26:22	42:6 49:4
16:4	11:9,11,12 16:10	FUTURE 6:21	34:15	<b>HELP</b> 25:17 47:7
<b>EXHIBIT</b> 25:12,15	20:17	<b>F.2D</b> 43:4 44:4	GRANTED 24:1	HENNIGAN 43:4
40:15,25	FILED 10:18,24	<b>F.3D</b> 42:18	GREAT 44:18	HE'LL 9:13,14
<b>EXIST</b> 38:9 49:15	27:23 38:12		GREATER 6:17	10:11
EXISTED 14:17	<b>FILING</b> 32:17	G	50:3	HIGHLY 51:6

		<del></del>	<del></del>	
HISTORICALLY	20:7,12 21:2,8	27:11	J	KRONENBERG
23:6	24:20 27:16,19	INTENTION 5:25		1:16,16 3:15,16
<b>HISTORY</b> 13:13	29:12 38:4 41:1	INTEREST 41:20	J 1:20	37:13,13,22 39:23
13:16 38:21	52:9	45:13	JACK 2:7	40:4,11,18 41:9
HIT 29:19	IDELL'S 26:4	INTERESTED	JAMES 1:14	41:17 42:8 43:16
<b>HOLDING</b> 30:25	IDENTICAL	30:16	JANUARY 25:22	43:23 44:2,12,15
42:3 43:19 49:18	21:21	INTERESTING	41:5	44:25 45:25 46:5
HOME 23:19	IDENTIFIED	10:9	JIMMERSON	46:11,15
HOMEOWNER	47:22 49:9	INTERNATION	26:10	40.11,13
19:5	IDENTIFIER 25:3	1:8	<b>JOB</b> 7:25 16:9	L
HOMEOWNERS	ILLEGAL 44:4	INTERNET 3:6	<b>JOHN</b> 24:1	L 40:15,25
19:6	IMMEDIATELY	4:12 6:18 22:19	JOLLA 2:3	LA 2:3
HOMEOWNER'S	37:8	1	<b>JONES</b> 13:9	LAND 18:24 19:4
18:11		24:2,3 26:19	<b>JOSE</b> 1:3 3:1	LANGUAGE
HONOR 3:13,14	IMMUNITY 33:20	INTERPRET 35:1	<b>JUDGE</b> 1:14 41:15	16:20,22,23 17:5
	IMPORT 26:1	INTERRUPT 9:16	46:18	26:3,4 33:9
3:15,21 5:9 9:19	IMPORTANT	INVADED 41:20	JUDGMENT 9:24	LAPTOP 51:8
9:21 10:9,15	30:23 40:4,5	INVENTED 24:2	21:4 27:5	LAPTOP 51:8 LARGE 4:13 45:7
11:24 12:16,24	41:18	INVOKE 14:9	<b>JUMP</b> 39:3	45:11
13:11 17:3,12,12	IMPORTANTLY	INVOLVE 44:7,10	JUSTICE 6:2	1
17:16,21 18:8	34:8	INVOLVED 9:8	<b>JUSTIFY</b> 30:10	LARGER 48:6
20:17 21:9 23:13	IMPOSE 27:13	INVOLVING		LATE 40:7
26:2,13 27:17,19	IMPOSED 21:6	13:15 37:9 49:18	K	LATIN 25:4 28:7
28:17,22,25 29:12	45:21	49:21	KARL 1:16 3:16	LAW 3:8 15:11,25
29:16,19 31:7,16	INABILITY 7:19	IP 4:13 5:3 7:1,20	KEEP 14:19 48:6	34:6,25 35:1,12
32:6 33:4,14 34:8	INCENTIVE 45:6	22:5 30:20 31:2,5	50:11	39:13 42:9 43:3
34:23 36:22 37:4	45:10	31:13,24,25 34:5	<b>KIND</b> 16:3	43:21 44:7 46:10
37:14,22 38:20	INCLUDING	35:9 38:22,23	KNOW 8:22,25 9:1	46:25
39:3,23 40:5	31:21 49:10	44:19 45:9 47:15	9:21 11:4 12:2	LAWS 47:4 49:19
41:17 42:8 44:2	INCONSISTENT	47:25 48:9,13	17:14,19,22,24	LAWSUIT 4:19
44:25 45:16 46:21	16:24	IRENE 1:25	18:4 21:11 29:9	30:10
47:10 48:20,23	INCORRECT 4:22	IRRECONCILA	30:17 38:25 39:6	LAWSUITS 49:20
51:21,25 52:9	INDEPENDENT	16:18	39:7	50:6
HONORABLE	42:13,21	ISP 4:14 6:2 7:1,4	KNOWN 29:5,7	LEAD 47:8
1:13	INDICATED	8:20 9:2,3	<b>KNOWS</b> 32:6 33:4	LEASE 18:19 45:8
HUGE 45:1,5,5	11:18 12:8	ISSUANCE 37:8	KREMEN 1:5 3:6	LEAVE 23:19
HUMMEL 2:7 3:9	INDIVIDUAL 6:3	40:9	3:16 4:22,24 5:6	LEGACY 13:21
3:13,22 29:16,17	8:18	<b>ISSUE</b> 4:1 5:9 9:23	5:17,18 7:22 9:1,9	23:25 24:8
30:19 31:2 35:16	INDUSTRY 46:25	11:25 12:1,2	10:10 12:6,10,20	LEGAL 11:11
35:19 36:7,20	47:18,20,23	13:14 14:14 17:8	14:10 15:1,23	36:18 44:11
51:25 52:2,8	INFORMATION	19:21 22:24 37:16	17:5,20,24 18:8	LEGALLY 49:15
HYPOTHETIC	31:10 33:10 34:10	38:10,15 39:4	18:18 19:24 20:25	LEGITIMATE
8:22	44:19 47:15 51:7	40:5 49:19	23:18 24:4,8	34:4 45:20 48:11
	INITIAL 42:14	ISSUED 4:17,20	25:23 26:18 27:3	LEGITIMIZE
I	<b>INJURED</b> 41:19	5:3 6:25 8:15	28:9,10,24 32:1,2	49:24
ICAM 49:21 50:6	<b>INSIST</b> 31:9	10:20 13:19 16:16	32:13 34:21 36:24	<b>LENGTHY</b> 19:20
IDELL 1:19,20	INSISTED 32:15	17:17 24:16 31:16	37:14 38:6 40:12	19:23
3:17 9:19 11:24	INTENDED 36:23	31:16 36:11,22	40:22 45:15,21	<b>LETTER</b> 24:20
12:5,12,23 17:2	INTENDING	<b>ISSUES</b> 3:25 9:23	46:21 48:17 49:10	40:15 41:1
17:11,16,21 18:1	15:19,22	37:16,18 40:14	KREMEN'S 4:18	LET'S 11:14 29:13
18:7 19:2,11,19	<b>INTENT</b> 7:16		12:20 50:13	32:9 39:17,25
	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR			

			<del></del>	
43:13	MEAN 51:6	47:22 51:8	32:18,25 33:7,19	37:12 48:16
LIABLE 47:1	MEANS 43:18 49:6	NAMED 24:1	36:7,12 38:18	OPPORTUNITY
LICENSES 22:1	MENTION 51:3	NAMES 15:14,24	NUMBERS 3:7	15:5 35:2
LIMITATIONS	MERE 46:2	30:20	4:12,16 7:1,20,23	<b>OPPOSING</b> 47:11
21:5 32:11 34:20	MERELY 16:4	NATURE 14:11	7:24 8:1,19 12:19	48:24
36:6 37:3,15,19	33:9,10,11 34:4	15:13	12:20,25,25 17:8	OPPOSITION
39:4,18 41:6,12	47:12,13	NECESSARY 6:1	17:8,18 20:16	10:18,24 15:2
41:21 42:1,3,7,16	MEXICO 24:13,24	26:11	47:25	16:6,6 19:25 20:1
42:21 43:2,15,20	MINUTE 28:11	NECK 46:7	NUMEROUS 36:9	27:22 38:13 49:3
50:17,18	32:10	NEED 12:16 15:7,8	N.W 2:8	ORDER 3:11,25
LIMITED 49:10	MISCONVEYED	16:20 36:16 43:25		4:4,20 5:22 6:12
LINE 43:3 44:12	15:16	44:19	0	6:13 7:10,12,13
LIST 8:10	MISLEADING 5:7	NEEDED 12:9	O 3:2	7:16,22 10:1,16
<b>LITTLE</b> 15:13	MISREADING	NEGOTIATED	<b>OBEY</b> 44:8	12:9 14:9 15:19
50:15	6:12	31:19	<b>OBEYED</b> 16:12	16:3,4,7,11 18:2,6
LOBBY 47:19	MISUSE 6:22	NEGOTIATION	OBJECTION	18:8 21:16,18,18
LOCATION 38:22	MISUSED 6:7	19:21	19:17,18 36:1	23:22 24:6,12,16
LONG 9:5 13:13	MODIFY 14:9	NEGOTIATIONS	<b>OBLIGATED</b> 38:6	24:18,22 25:6,25
13:16 14:17 19:22	21:18	32:19,22 37:9	OBLIGATIONS	26:6 27:1,14
38:21 43:6 49:12	MOMENT 36:10	NEITHER 10:21	37:1	29:23 31:16,17,20
LOOK 11:7,22	MOMENTS 20:16	NET 4:17 12:25	OBSERVED 48:1	32:13,20,24 35:4
12:3 17:17 23:10	MONITORING	13:24 17:7 20:22	<b>OBTAIN</b> 4:13,14	35:17,23,25 36:10
25:14,15,21 27:1	51:2	24:5,6,11,11 26:7	8:14 31:14 45:4	36:23 37:7 38:1,2
43:9,17,25 50:9	MONOPOLIZA	28:5 38:10,14	51:1	40:6,10,13,23
50:15	30:5 33:24	40:21 45:3,4	<b>OBTAINED</b> 4:5	41:4 45:17 51:24
	MONOPOLY 34:1	NETWORK 51:7	10:8	<b>ORDERED</b> 31:24
M	49:5	NEVER 9:10 10:22	<b>OBTAINING</b> 7:3	ORDERING 15:16
<b>M</b> 2:6	MONTGOMERY	12:12 19:23 20:1	34:5	ORDERS 5:3,12
<b>MAIN</b> 16:11,12,13	1:17	27:21 28:15	OBTAINMENT	9:6 14:20,23,25
MAINTAIN 7:20	<b>MONTH</b> 41:3	NEW 14:4 25:2	51:1	ORGANIZATION
27:11 34:16	MORNING 3:12	42:2,13,20	OCCUR 42:14	39:9 49:21
MAINTENANCE	3:13,14,15,22	NONCOMPLIA	OCCURRED	ORIGINAL 8:15
33:25	9:19 29:16 30:21	35:22	32:13 35:22 36:10	21:21 24:16
<b>MAJOR</b> 39:12	31:8 38:12 46:20	NONPROFIT 39:9	39:21	OUTRAGED 25:8
MAKING 13:3	MOTION 3:11,20	NORMAL 6:14	OCEAN 1:8 38:16	OVERT 42:12
22:10	3:23 10:18 13:15	27:9,13 39:10	<b>OCTOBER</b> 1:6 3:1	OWNERSHIP
MAN 24:1	27:22 29:14,20	NORMALLY 39:7	OFFER 11:22	27:3
MANAGEMENT	36:16	NORR-PENING	<b>OFFERS</b> 32:22	<b>OWNING</b> 48:13
52:2	MOTIONS 3:22	32:21 33:19	OFFICERS 33:2	OWNS 38:17
MANATT 2:6 3:8	29:14	NORTHERN 1:2	OFFICIAL 1:25	O'CLOCK 52:3
MANDATE 16:15	MOVANT 3:10	NOTEBOOK 24:2	ONCE 20:1,14	
MANIPULATE	<b>MOVE</b> 26:24	NOTED 47:16	38:13 50:15	P
37:5	29:13 33:23	<b>NOTICE</b> 35:2 37:7	<b>ONES</b> 13:23,25	P 1:15,15 2:1,1,3
MARKET 33:21	<b>MOVING 29:18</b>	41:14 43:19	17:17	3:2
34:14 45:8,14	48:25	NOTICED 51:3	OPERATING 51:9	PACNET 10:4
47:24 48:12 49:7		NOVEMBER	OPERATION	12:18 40:12,20,22
50:2	N	24:21 41:3	49:16,25	41:1
<b>MATTER</b> 26:6,24	N 1:15 2:1 3:2	NUMBER 1:25 3:5	OPERATIONS	PAGE 1:23 49:3
34:6 44:17 46:23	NAME 11:8 12:20	9:23 20:22,23	51:7	PAGES 1:8
51:23 52:3,10	13:2,9 30:24	25:2 29:19 32:10	OPPONENT 9:18	PALLOR 50:3
, ,		MJ.M MJ.17 J2.10		
				-

			<del></del>	
PAPER 25:19	PLAINTIFF'S	PRE-ARIN 39:1	19:13	23:20
48:25	41:19	PRICE 34:2	PROVISIONS	REFER 33:14
PAPERS 25:10	PLAN 51:16	PRIMARY 51:5	31:11 34:13 51:2	REFERRED 27:24
26:14 49:3	PLAUSIBLY	PRIOR 42:24 43:7	PUBLISH 8:10	REFLECTION
PAPERWORK 6:1	49:24	PRIVATE 47:19	PULL 16:18	16:5
22:11 26:2,9 28:9	PLAYERS 45:7,14	PROBABLY 28:2	PURE 44:21	REFUSAL 50:13
28:10	PLEADING 21:21	PROBLEM 14:17	PURPORTS 29:24	REFUSE 43:12,14
PARAGRAPH	51:16	15:4 45:2,5	PURPOSE 42:15	REFUSED 6:9
26:8	PLED 47:22	PROCEDURAL	PURPOSES 11:20	43:10
PART 7:17 24:5	POINT 9:7 13:11	28:18		1
49:8 50:22	35:25 36:2 40:5	PROCEDURES	PURSUE 24:11	REGARD 4:16
PARTE 4:5 5:17	40:19 49:24 51:11	1	PUT 8:4 27:3 42:10	6:11 18:17 23:24
5:23	4	50:25	43:19 45:6 51:5	REGARDING
PARTICIPANTS	51:16,19,20	PROCEED 41:2	52:4	37:24,24 40:14
47:18	POINTING 39:19	PROCEEDINGS	<b>PUTTING</b> 36:24	51:7
PARTIES 7:3 8:12	POLICIES 38:3 47:13	1:12 3:4 19:24	Q	REGARDLESS
1		39:8 52:10		36:12 41:5
8:23,25 9:4,8 31:19	POLICY 42:19,20	PROCESS 5:21 8:9	4:14	REGISTER 5:17
	42:25 44:16,17 <b>PORTION</b> 23:25	13:1,12 15:18,20	QUASI 50:5	7:21 12:22
PARTY 5:13,14,15		19:21,23 25:10	QUESTION 12:7	REGISTERING
7:9,17 8:1,5 23:14	23:25 24:10,12	26:12 41:14	38:8 44:8 47:2,5	12:19
23:15 25:1 28:23 29:18	POSITION 11:16	PRODUCE 10:25	50:11,16	REGISTRANT
1	34:13 48:15 50:2	PRODUCED	QUESTIONING	6:15
PASS 21:19	POSSESSION	10:22	17:10	REGISTRANTS
PASSED 50:15,17	45:23 51:5	PRODUCTIONS	QUESTIONS 39:5	23:1 45:22
PATHS 47:8	POSSIBILITY 7:8	10:21	1 -	REGISTRAR 15:9
PAY 6:6,21	POSTELLE 24:1	PROFFER 51:13	<b>QUOTE</b> 42:12	15:24
PAYMENT 31:10	POTENTIALLY	PROHIBIT 45:7	R	REGISTRATION
33:11 34:10 DENDING 47.6	7:18	PROHIBITING	R 1:15,17 2:1 3:2	7:6 18:2 27:9
PENDING 47:6	POWER 34:1 48:8	45:14	RAISED 29:20	31:6 33:12 34:12
49:20 50:7	49:22 51:11	PROHIBITS 32:6	READ 25:11,13,25	40:21 50:14,21
PEOPLE 5:10 7:9	POWERS 13:13,17	PRONOUNCING	46:18 47:7	51:1
8:12 9:2 44:19	PRACTICED 46:9	11:8	REALLY 9:9	REGISTRY 3:6
46:9	PRECISE 36:13	PROPER 15:21	22:23 32:12,12	4:11,12 50:22,25
PERFECTLY	PREDATORY	PROPERLY 5:9	42:4	REGULAR 6:7
24:14,24	34:2,7	6:6 9:14 39:19	REASON 4:6 6:9	REGULATED
PERIOD 8:1 35:10	PREMISED 4:21	PROPERTY 9:23	20:4,9 21:7,8	13:20
42:5 43:6	PREPARE 26:14	9:25 15:15,17	34:18 40:19	REGULATIONS
PERMISSION	PREREQUISITES	18:9,10,13,16,19	RECALL 14:22	16:16 18:14,20
37:14 46:16	31:4 34:5	19:8 21:24 30:15	RECEIVED 5:5	<b>REISSUE</b> 5:13,20
PHELPS 2:6	PRESENT 47:3	31:1	37:7	13:6
PHILLIPS 2:6	PRESENTATION	PROPOSED 14:23	<b>RECITE 29:25</b>	REJECTED 11:23
PICTURE 13:20	13:5	27:1	RECITES 29:24	<b>RELATE</b> 37:18
PIECE 21:24	PRESENTED	PROTECT 21:14	RECOGNIZE	38:9,14,16
PLACE 12:3 18:19	12:12 14:23 15:3	PROTECTION	41:24	RELATED 1:11
41:25 45:6	19:19 38:19	23:2		RELATES 29:21
PLACES 36:9	PRESUMING	<b>PROVE</b> 10:6 18:6	RECOGNIZED	38:3
PLAINTIFF 11:17	50:13	20:14 23:14	41:24 PECORD 12:24	RELATING 32:19
41:19 46:21	PREVENT 7:25	PROVIDE 8:17	RECORD 12:24	RELATIONSHIP
PLAINTIFFS 1:6	PREVIOUSLY	PROVIDED 22:21	RECORDS 8:25	34:9,14 35:9
1:16 2:2	47:17	PROVIDES 9:25	RECOURSES	RELEVANT 33:21

<del></del>			<del></del>	
41:6	11:17 14:23 17:7	43:11	10:15 29:22 31:16	SIGNING 15:23
RELIEF 28:19	RESPONSE 10:22	RUNS 18:24 19:4	45:17	19:17 27:9 33:12
REPLY 10:10	REST 31:15	RYAN 2:6 3:8,8,20	SERIES 14:22	34:11
19:24 25:10 42:11	RESTARTED	3:21 4:3,11 8:8,15	SERIOUS 38:8	SIGNS 9:13 22:1
REPORTER 1:25	41:22	8:24 13:4 21:15	SERVED 37:7	SIMILAR 13:2
REPRESENT	RESTRAIN 32:8	21:20 22:8,13,15	40:20 41:4	43:10
26:13	RESTRAINTS	22:18 23:4,9,12	SERVICE 5:2 6:20	SIMILARLY 24:9
REPRESENTA	32:6	23:24 25:15,21	6:23 24:9 31:17	SIMPLE 10:3 17:4
4:7,21,23 5:6 9:4	RESTRICTED	26:4 27:20 30:20	36:1,2 37:5 40:6	SIMPLE 10.3 17.4 SIMPLER 9:21
REPRESENTED	19:10 49:6	31:21 37:10	41:9,11,12,13	SIMPLY 5:1 9:1
19:23	RESTRICTION	31.21 37.10	SERVICES 6:6 7:3	27:3 35:8 38:1,25
1	21:1 23:3	S	31:6 33:12 34:12	SIX-FOOT 19:9
REQUESTED 31:5	RESTRICTIONS	S 1:15,16 2:1,7 3:2	SERVING 35:25	SMALL 24:10 45:1
REQUIRED 5:2	18:11 19:1,2	SAFER 47:9	SET 52:3	45:3,8
15:21,24 17:11	45:21	SAN 1:3,18,21 2:4	SETTLEMENT	SMALLER 45:7
21:5 27:10 45:20	RESULT 39:8	3:1 18:9,10,17	28:2 32:22	48:7,13
46:9 50:25	RETAINS 31:9	SANDMAN 10:4	SHAPE 16:7	SMITH 13:9
REQUIREMENT	RETURN 25:5	SATISFYING 27:5	SHAPED 16:8	SOFTWARE
33:10 34:10,11	REVIEW 21:17	SAYING 6:5 10:11	SHERMAN 29:25	21:25
46:3 47:14 50:14	REVISED 45:23	10:13 14:2 26:1	30:1 32:5 33:17	SOLELY 6:10
50:21	REVOCATION	28:11 41:2	33:24	SOLVE 14:13
REQUIREMEN	23:22	SAYS 9:13 11:9	SHOES 10:12	28:24
27:9	REVOKE 5:12,20	19:7 24:6,21	12:14 14:4,11	SORRY 3:18
REQUIRES 15:11	7:12,14 9:6	27:25 39:21,22	29:1 36:24	SORT 36:1 38:21
33:25 50:20	REVOKED 7:11	40:7 41:5	SHORT 21:12	SOUGHT 24:17,18
REQUIRING	RE-ISSUE 8:5	SBC 4:15 6:3	33:18	SOUNDS 13:6
14:25 33:11,11	RICHARD 1:20	SCHOOL 44:7	SHORTLY 51:24	SOURCES 22:5
44:18	RIGHT 6:8,23 7:12	SECOND 21:22	SHOW 7:14 24:19	SPACE 24:5,8
REREGISTER	7:14 8:11 18:23	22:3 26:8 29:14	SHOWING 20:18	SPECIFIC 31:8
10:16	19:16 21:10 23:12	SECTION 29:25	SHOWN 10:7	34:5 42:9
REREGISTERI	23:12,17,18,24	30:1,4 32:5,9 33:6	SHUTTING 7:6	SPECIFICALLY
14:10	24:19 26:23 30:4	33:16,18,23 34:19	SIDE 14:15 15:19	42:17 47:21
RESOLUTION	31:1,14 36:15	34:22	20:18	SPECIFICS 46:6
23:15 29:10	39:20,25 46:2,5	SEE 16:9 17:1 25:4	SIDES 15:7	SPELLED 7:16
RESOLVE 11:21	RIGHTS 6:17,19	27:20 45:16 48:3	SIGN 5:2,10,25 6:4	SPUN 25:6
16:25 17:13 22:23	8:14 26:18,19,20	SEEK 24:22	11:19,20 12:6,8	STAFF 26:14
25:1 26:5	27:12 31:8 36:25	SEEKING 4:3	12:13 14:3,3,25	STAGE 51:16
RESOLVED 29:8	RODRIGUEZ	23:15	17:10 20:5,7,9,10	STAGES 23:2
RESOURCE 27:11	1:25	SEEN 43:21	20:12,25 21:17	STAND 9:9 25:9
RESOURCES 5:9	RSA 21:23 22:9,19	SEITEL 1:19	22:2,3,5,10,11,25	START 9:20 36:5
5:18,23 6:4,5,8,9	22:22,25 23:16	SELECTIVELY	23:18 26:15 45:21	STARTED 20:16
6:22,25 7:11,15	32:2	44:21	46:3 48:18 50:14	28:10 29:6 37:21
8:11,16,17 9:11	RSA'S 21:25	SELF-EXECUT	50:21	40:1
10:8 11:3,10 13:5	RULE 28:21	35:24	SIGNED 12:9	STARTING 39:24
13:19,21 20:20	RULES 9:14 16:16	SELF-INTERES	17:23 18:17,22	41:25 43:4
22:25 23:5,22	18:12,14,20 19:5	47:17	21:23 22:3 23:17	STATE 30:2
27:4 30:14,20		SENSE 44:6,10	28:15 32:2,14	STATED 13:4
	19:7,13,14 RUN 35:15 37:3	52:4	48:18	STATEMENT
31:5,13,24,25 34:6 35:10	45:4	SENT 24:20	SIGNIFICANT	10:9 11:15
RESPECT 11:17	45:4 <b>RUNNING</b> 36:5	SEPTEMBER		STATES 1:1,13
RESTECT 11:1/	KUMMING 50:5		22:16,18	01A1E01.1,13
		· I		

	<del> </del>			· .
STATUS 10:7	<b>SUITE</b> 1:18,21 2:4	41:18,23	TRYING 16:1	31:6
STATUTE 30:3	2:8	THINGS 24:4,23	23:13 27:8 28:24	VERIZON 6:3
32:10,11 33:19	SUPPLEMENT	24:25 25:1	TURN 45:9	VERSION 22:4,20
35:14 36:5 37:3,5	19:25	THINK 28:20	TWO 3:21 10:19	VERSUS 3:6
37:15,18 39:4,17	SUPPORT 35:11	34:24 36:20	10:23 24:25 32:18	VILLAGE 2:3
41:6,12,15,21,25	SUPPORTER 4:25	THIRD 7:3 8:12,23	34:15 36:12 40:8	VIOLATE 31:12
42:2,7,16,21 43:1	SUPREME 48:2	8:25 9:4,8	44:3 49:20 50:6	VIOLATED 46:10
43:12,15,20 50:16	49:4	THREE 7:9 28:8	TYPE 31:2	47:3
50:17	SURE 7:7 14:15	32:25		VIOLATING
STATUTORY	28:23 29:3 37:20	TIE 27:6	U	49:18
34:19,20 35:14	SURRENDERED	TIM 3:18	UNCLEAR 38:14	VIOLATION
STEEL 42:17,22	15:1	TIME 10:11 19:11	UNDERSTAND	39:17 48:19
43:4	SURVIVES 33:1	21:12,12,25 23:5	19:17 22:13 48:4	VOLUNTARILY
STEP 10:11 14:4	SWITCH 13:8,8	26:23 27:7 32:17	UNDERSTOOD	4:25 25:5
29:1	SYSTEMS 13:18	35:6,16,21 37:2	26:10	
STEPHEN 2:6		37:20 39:5 40:5	UNDISPUTED	W
STEPS 14:10	T	41:18,19 42:5	10:4 31:23	<b>WAIT</b> 28:11
STEVE 3:8	<b>TAKE</b> 13:5 16:25	43:7 50:1 51:4	<b>UNFAIR</b> 37:16	WAIVED 36:2
STICK 36:8 39:17	24:7,10 27:1,12	52:8	UNILATERAL	<b>WANT</b> 5:2 9:9,11
46:7	31:14 36:16 43:13	TIMES 49:9	30:4	9:20 12:2 14:5
STICKING 35:20	43:17 48:15 50:9	TIMOTHY 2:3	UNINTENTION	15:9 21:13 22:23
STIPULATION	51:11	TODAY 16:10	5:7	23:21 29:1 45:3
40:12,23	<b>TAKEN 27:6</b>	17:13 20:17 21:17	<b>UNIQUE</b> 7:25 8:1	48:17
STOP 44:7	<b>TAKES</b> 19:8 27:14	22:5,21,25 23:19	25:2	<b>WANTED</b> 6:4 7:7
<b>STREET</b> 1:17,20	27:14 41:25	30:11	UNIQUENESS	9:7,10,12 25:24
2:8	TALK 30:21 32:9	<b>TOLD</b> 28:14 36:4	7:20	26:7,8,18,19,20
STUDENT 8:18	32:22 52:7	39:20	UNITED 1:1,13	28:22
<b>STUFF</b> 44:9	TALKED 31:7	TOLLING 41:15	UNLAWFUL 49:5	<b>WANTS</b> 25:1
SUBJECT 18:2	<b>TARDY</b> 36:1,2	<b>TOTALLY</b> 22:10	UNLAWFULLY	WARE 1:14
32:15 43:13 50:6	40:3	39:14	27:8	WASHINGTON
SUBMISSION	TEAM 11:11	TOUCH 9:2	UNREASONAB	2:9 26:5
47:14 51:23	TELECOMMU	TRACE 8:22 20:20	32:7	<b>WASN'T</b> 7:16
<b>SUBMIT</b> 28:22	45:11	TRACKS 30:3	UNWILLING 5:24	<b>WASTE</b> 26:17
SUBMITTED	TELL 11:22 16:24	<b>TRADE</b> 32:6,8	26:21	WATCH 14:19
26:25	25:9,13 26:13	TRANSFER 6:19	UNYIELDING	WAY 5:4,8,17 6:16
SUBPOENAS	TELLING 8:13	11:20 12:9 15:11	5:25	7:7,18 9:15,21
10:19,22	36:3	15:21 16:13 23:20	USE 6:5 8:2,3,17	11:6 13:18 16:10
SUBSTANCE	TENDERED 11:19	31:24 32:15 43:14	9:13 18:15 47:25	16:18,25 24:7
50:18	TENTH 33:15	TRANSFERRED	USUAL 26:9 27:13	27:4 30:15 31:17
SUBSTANTIVE	TERMS 13:3 31:12	5:14 6:10 15:17	USUALLY 47:8	40:18 46:1
46:22	31:20 32:15 36:15	16:14 24:6,13,14	UU 13:24 24:5,6,10	WEEKS 40:8
SUE 7:9	TERRI 1:17 3:17	24:23	24:11 28:5	WELD 44:4
SUED 39:9	46:20	TREASURY 8:4	<b>U.S</b> 6:2 48:1 49:2,4	WEREN'T 7:17
SUFFICE 28:3	TERRY 37:17	TRIAL 18:8		37:6 42:9
30:24	TEST 33:1	TRUE 5:1 10:12		WE'LL 52:6
SUFFICIENT 8:24	THANK 21:10,20	18:16,21 36:17	V 1:7 49:2	WE'RE 14:2 26:1
30:10	29:12 51:22 52:8	<b>TRUST</b> 9:25 14:12	VACATE 52:5	28:23 36:4 41:2
SUGGEST 16:21	52:9	21:4	VALID 12:17	43:7 45:16 51:15
SUGGESTION	THEMES 29:20	TRUTH 23:13	VARIOUS 14:25	WHATSOEVER
17:3,4	<b>THING</b> 18:21 39:7	TRY 27:13 29:9	23:2 28:18,18	33:21 38:24
				_

				Page It
WILLING 5:22	1		1	
14:24 20:10,12	2			
WILLINGNESS	2 23:16 30:1 33:23			
11:19	34:22			ļ
WISH 14:20	20005 2:9			
WORDS 31:12	<b>2001</b> 3:11,24 6:13			·
50:20	24:22 25:25 29:22			
WORK 5:8 40:24	31:17 37:25 38:2			
WORKED 40:24	39:21,24 40:1,2			·
WORKED 40.24 WORKING 40:13	45:17			
WORN 47:8	2002 24:14,23			
WOULDN'T 14:12	2003 24:16,21 36:3			
17:11	36:3 40:7,7 41:3,4	·		
WROTE 24:3	2004 25:22 26:16			•
WRO1E 24.3	29:6,7,8 40:8 41:5			
Y	2006 1:6 3:1			,
YEARS 9:22 32:16	220 1:17			
42:23,24 43:1	<b>23</b> 1:6 3:1			
YEH 2:7 3:9,14	3			·
	3 23:16			
Z	<b>30</b> 25:23			
<b>ZLAK</b> 25:6 40:7	<b>30TH</b> 25:22			
41:4	300 1:21	İ		
<b>ZLAK'S</b> 11:8			· ·	
17:18 25:16	4			
	465 1:20			
0	4660 2:3			
03 31:18,18			·	
1	6			
129:25 30:4 32:5,9	<b>6TH</b> 41:3			
33:6,16,18 34:19	60 28:21			
<b>1-52</b> 1:8	<b>688</b> 44:5			
<b>10:00</b> 52:3				
<b>11,000</b> 49:9	7			
11,500 23:4	700 2:8			
1100 2:8	<b>742</b> 44:4			
<b>111</b> 42:17	7752:4			
1194 44:4	<b>787</b> 43:4			
12TH 2:8	8			
<b>12,000</b> 7:1	8074 1:25			
<b>1289</b> 43:5	00741.23			
14 42:24	9			
<b>1427</b> 42:18	9 22:19,22,25 23:16			
17TH 10:15 29:22	<b>92122</b> 2:4			
<b>18</b> 42:23 49:3	94104 1:18,21			·
18-YEAR 42:22	· ··· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
43:15			.	
1920 1:18	·			
<b>1998</b> 6:3 39:2 49:16				
2,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
		1	1i	