Document 57-21

Filed 09/27/2007

Page 2 of 6

Case 2:06-cv-01110-RLH-GWF

Ist Technology had attached a WHOIS search result for newbodog.com to its Opposition to Bodog's Request for a Stay. This result indicated that "[the] whois service shows the information for .COM and .NET domains . . . [that] . . . are registered thru DotRegistrar.com." (Balasubramani Decl., Ex B.) The WHOIS information provided by EuroDNS (the same entity Bodog claims is located in Luxemborg) reflects this identical information (that the domain names are registered to DotRegistrar). "DOTREGISTRAR, LLC" (as reflected in the Secretary of State Database for the State of Washington) is a Washington limited liability company. The Court may take judicial notice of both of these facts, 1 which show that Bodog is incorrect in its statement that the new domain names are located off-shore.

In any event, this is a red herring. Bodog registered and utilized the new domain names to frustrate 1st Technology's collection efforts and to migrate its users to the new domain names. At a minimum, Bodog should be prevented from further transferring these names (or siphoning users from Bodog's gambling sites) pending resolution of the Nevada Motion.

The Court may take judicial notice of both WHOIS information and corporate residence, both of which are publicly available on the internet. See, e.g., City of Monroe Employees Ret. Sys. v. Bridgestone Corp., 399 F.3d 651, 655 n.1 (6th Cir. 2005) (taking judicial notice of a term defined on the website of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.); Schaffer v. Clinton, 240 F.3d 878, 885 n.8 (10th Cir. 2001) (taking judicial notice of information found in a political reference almanac and citing to the almanac's website); Grimes Navigant Consulting, Inc., 185 F. Supp. 2d 906, 913 (N.D. III. 2002) (taking judicial notice of published stock prices found on the world wide web).

1

6

10 11 12

14 15

13

16 17

18

20

19

21 22

24

23

26

27

25

THE ILLEGATLITY OF BODOG'S OPERATIONS ARE RELEVANT TO THE MOTION

Bodog does not dispute – nor could it reasonably dispute – whether online gambling made available to Washington and United States residents violate Washington and United States laws. It argues instead that whether or not Bodog is engaged in illegal activity is not relevant to the issues before the Court. (See Bodog's Opposition, fn. 1.) None of the cases cited by Bodog deal with a party before the court that is engaged in illegal conduct using the property at issue in the proceeding.

Bodog attempts to distance itself from the actual entity which conducts the "Bodog"-branded gambling operations by arguing that it provides "technical services, including domain name management, for various entities, including but not limited to entities that use the BODOG name and variations thereof to provide various online entertainment services." (See Bodog's Opposition, fn. 1.) First, this wholly conclusory statement is unsupported by any statements by executives of Bodog, or any evidence whatsoever. Second, this statement flies in the face of evidence and public statements made by Bodog itself (including but not limited to, Bodog's own trademark registration filings).

CONCLUSION

Bodog operates websites that violate Washington and United States laws. Additionally, Bodog constitutes a flight risk. Bodog does not have any Washington or United States entities, and operates its business through foreign entities, including entities based in Costa Rica and (now) Malta. This coupled

1

7

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

2627

1ST TECHNOLOGY LCC'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR WRIT OF EXECUTION REGARDING ADDITIONAL DOMAIN NAMES / PAGE - 4

with Bodog's public statements that it would work to frustrate creditors is sufficient to warrant granting of 1st Technology's Motion. In any event, Bodog should be required to post a bond equal to the amount of the judgment for execution to obtain the relief it seeks. Absent posting of a bond, it is inappropriate to halt 1st Technology's collections efforts pending resolution of the Nevada Motion. This is particularly so, where 1st Technology is willing to agree to not dispose of the domain names pending resolution of the Nevada Motion.

Respectfully submitted, this 11th day of September, 2007.

Venkat Balasubramani

Counsel for 1st Technology LLC

1ST TECHNOLOGY LCC'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR WRIT OF EXECUTION REGARDING ADDITIONAL DOMAIN NAMES / PAGE - 5

BALASUBRAMANI LAW 8426 40th AVE SW SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98136 telephone (206) 529-4827 fax (206) 260-3966