1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Jeffrey A. LeVee (State Bar No. 125863) Erin L. Burke (State Bar No. 186660) Rachel T. Gezerseh (State Bar No. 251299) Amanda Pushinsky (State Bar No. 267950) JONES DAY 555 South Flower Street Fiftieth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071.2300 Telephone: +1.213.489.3939 Facsimile: +1.213.243.2539  Attorneys for Defendant INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNE NAMES AND NUMBERS  SUPERIOR COURT OF TI	D HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	COUNTY OF LOS ANGE	CLES, CENTRAL DISTRICT	
11			
12	DOTCONNECTAFRICA TRUST,	CASE NO. BC607494	
13	Plaintiff,	Assigned for all purposes to Hon. Howard L. Halm	
14	v.	ICANN'S RESPONSES TO DCA'S	
15 16	INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, et al.,	EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF JEFFREY A. LEVEE	
17	Defendant.		
18		DATE: February 2, 2017	
19		TIME: 8:30 a.m. DEPT: 53	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	ICANN'S RESPONSES TO DCA'S OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF J. LEVEE		

5	LeVee Declaration	DCA Objection	ICANN's Response	Court's Ruling
6	¶ 5: In May 2015, a two-day	1. Best evidence	Best Evidence. Mr.	
7	final hearing was held in the DCA IRP. On July 9, 2015,	rule. (Evid. Code § 1520)	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the	
8	the IRP Panel issued a 63-		contents of a writing. Mr.	
9	page final declaration		LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge	
9	("Declaration"). Paragraphs 92-117 (pages 39- 54) detail		of the IRP Panel's	
10	the IRP Panel's findings		Declaration and IRP	
11	regarding the merits of		proceedings.	
**	DCA's claims. The IRP			
12	Panel's discussion is devoted			
13	exclusively to the Board's acceptance of the GAC's			
	Advice. The IRP Panel			
14	concludes that ICANN's			
15	Board did not act			
	consistently with ICANN's			
16	Articles and Bylaws in			
17	accepting the GAC's Advice. (¶ 115.) With respect to all of			
	DCA's other claims, the IRP			
18	Panel reaches no conclusion			
19	except to state in Paragraph			
20	117 that: [Plaintiff] had criticized ICANN for its			
20	various actions and decisions			
21	throughout this IRP and			
22	ICANN has responded to			
22	each of these criticisms in			
23	detail. However, the Panel,			
24	having carefully considered these criticisms and decided			
	that the above [i.e., its			
25	finding regarding the GAC's			
26	Advice] is dispositive of this			
	IRP, [] does not find it			
27	necessary to determine who was right, to what extent and			
28	for what reasons in respect to			
20	for what reasons in respect to	1		<u> </u>

,	the other criticisms and			
1	alleged shortcomings of the			
2	27 ICANN Board identified			
_	by DCA Trust.			
3	LeVee Declaration	DCA Objection	ICANN's Response	Court's Ruling
4	¶ 6: The IRP Panel	1. Best evidence	Best Evidence. Mr.	
5	recommends that "ICANN	rule. (Evid. Code §	LeVee's statement is not	
۱ د	continue to refrain from	1520.)	offered to prove the	
6	delegating the .AFRICA	ĺ	contents of a writing. Mr.	
ĭ	gTLD and permit [Plaintiffs]		LeVee's testimony is based	
7	application to proceed		on his personal knowledge	
1	through the remainder of the		of the IRP Panel's	
8	new gTLD application		Declaration and IRP	
9	process" (id. ¶¶133, 148-		proceedings.	
9	149). The IRP Panel			
10	concludes that DCA is the			
- "	prevailing party and orders			
11	ICANN to pay DCA's costs.			
,	(¶¶ 139, 146, 150.)			
12	LeVee Declaration	DCA Objection	TCANNII- Dansana	Court's
13			ICANN's Response	Ruling
13	¶ 7: The IRP Panel made no	1. Best evidence	Best Evidence. Mr.	
14	findings whatsoever that	rule. (Evid. Code §	LeVee's statement is not	
	could be construed to remove	1520.)	offered to prove the	
15	or eliminate the Guidebook		contents of a writing. Mr.	
16	requirement that an		LeVee's testimony is based	
10	application for a gTLD		on his personal knowledge	
17	representing a geographic		of the IRP Panel's	
-	region (such as .AFRICA)		Declaration, IRP	
18	must obtain the support or		proceedings and	
	nonobjection of at least 60%		Deposition of Sophia	
19	of the governments in that		Bekele.	
20	region. To the contrary, as			
	the IRP Panel notes in			
21	Paragraph 46 (on page 14),			
	DCA specifically asked the			
22	IRP Panel to give DCA "no			
23	less than 18 months to obtain			
~~	Government support as set			
24	out in the [Guidebook] or			
	accept that the requirement is			
25	satisfied as a result of the endorsement of DCA Trust's			}
26				
20	application by UNECA," but the IRP Panel did not address			
27	DCA's request at all. Ms.			
	Bekele confirmed in			
28	Devele commined in			
		3		

I	deposition her understanding			
1	that nothing in the IRP			
2	Declaration addressed			
_	whether or not DCA had			
3	passed the requirement of			
	obtaining 60 percent			
4	governmental support, and			
5	she further confirmed that the			
ا ا	IRP Panel did not find that			
6	DCA could "skip" that			
	evaluation. See Ex. H at			
7	203:4-7.			
8	LeVee Declaration	DCA Objection	ICANN's Response	Court's Ruling
9	¶ 8: In its briefs to the IRP	1. Best evidence	Best evidence: Mr.	
	Panel, ICANN argued that	rule (Evid. Code §	LeVee's statement is not	
10	IRP panel declarations were	1520).	offered to prove the	
	not binding on ICANN's		contents of a writing. Mr.	
11	Board. ICANN's argument		LeVee's testimony is based	
12	was based, in part, on the fact		on his personal knowledge of the DCA IRP	
	that the only previous IRP		proceedings and past IRP	
13	declaration to have been		proceedings.	
1.4	issued (as of that time) expressly found that IRP		proceedings.	
14	panel declarations are not			
15	binding.1 The DCA IRP Panel			
	disagreed, however, and in a			
16	14 August 2014 declaration			
17	on procedural issues			
1'	("Procedural Declaration"),			
18	the IRP Panel determined			
	that its declaration would be			
19	binding on ICANN's Board.			
20	The portions of the			:
20	Procedural Declaration that			
21	address this point are			
22	reproduced at paragraph 23			
22	(pages 5-6) of the IRP Panel's Declaration.			
23	Faller's Declaration.			
	n.1. A true and correct copy			
24	of an excerpt of this previous			
25	IRP declaration is attached to			
	the concurrently-filed			
26	declaration of Akram			
27	Atallah.			
27				
28		1		
		4		
	l		THE THE PARTY OF A PARTY OF	T T T2X/12/12

1	LeVee Declaration	DCA Objection	ICANN's Response	Court's Ruling
2	¶ 9: Most importantly,	1. Best evidence	Best evidence: Mr.	
_	however, the question of	rule (Evid. Code §	LeVee's statement is not	
3	whether the IRP Panel's	1520).	offered to prove the	
4	Declaration was considered	2. Lacks foundation (Evid.	contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based	
	binding in conjunction with the <i>DCA</i> IRP became a moot	Code § 403).	on his personal knowledge	
5	point when ICANN's Board	Code 9 405).	of the IRP Panel's	
6	elected to adopt <i>all</i> of the		Declaration and actions of	
0	findings and	:	ICANN's Board.	
7	recommendations in the IRP			
	Panel's Declaration. A copy	:	Foundation: Mr. LeVee	
8	of the resolution by ICANN's		laid the foundation for his	
9	Board adopting the IRP		testimony. Mr. LeVee	
	Panel's Declaration is		testified that he is counsel	
10	attached to the concurrently		to ICANN. (LeVee Decl. ¶  1.) As such, he has	
11	filed Declaration of Akram		personal knowledge of the	
11	Atallah.		IRP Panel's Declaration	
12			and actions of ICANN's	
			Board.	
13	LeVee Declaration	DCA Objection		Court's
14			ICANN's Response	Ruling
11	T 10 D C 1 C1 1 11 11	1 D . 1 D 1 J	Deat Estalance Ma	l II
ا ء ا	¶ 10: DCA filed this suit	1. Best Evidence	Best Evidence. Mr.	
15	against ICANN on January	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not	
	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles		LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the	
16	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr.	
	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based	
16 17	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge	
16	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order,	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based	
16 17	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court,	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction,	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on the basis of an admitted	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on the basis of an admitted factual error and before DCA	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on the basis of an admitted factual error and before DCA admitted in deposition that	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on the basis of an admitted factual error and before DCA	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on the basis of an admitted factual error and before DCA admitted in deposition that the entire basis on which the	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on the basis of an admitted factual error and before DCA admitted in deposition that the entire basis on which the district court had granted the injunction - that the IRP Panel had allowed DCA to	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on the basis of an admitted factual error and before DCA admitted in deposition that the entire basis on which the district court had granted the injunction - that the IRP Panel had allowed DCA to skip the geographic review	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	against ICANN on January 20, 2016, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. After the Superior Court denied DCA's request for a temporary restraining order, ICANN timely removed the case to federal court, invoking diversity jurisdiction. On March 1, 2016, DCA moved for a preliminary injunction, which the federal court granted on April 12, 2016 on the basis of an admitted factual error and before DCA admitted in deposition that the entire basis on which the district court had granted the injunction - that the IRP Panel had allowed DCA to	Rule (Evid. Code	LeVee's statement is not offered to prove the contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	

1	LeVee Declaration	DCA Objection	ICANN's Response	Court's Ruling
2	¶ 11: Following remand, DCA again moved for	1. Best Evidence Rule (Evid. Code	Best Evidence. Mr. LeVee's statement is not	
3	preliminary injunction based	§ 1520.)	offered to prove the	
4	on its ninth cause of action. The Court denied that motion		contents of a writing. Mr. LeVee's testimony is based	
5	on December 22, 2016 based on "the reasoning expressed		on his personal knowledge of the procedural posture	
6	in the oral and written arguments of defense		and filings of this case.	
7 8	counsel." Attached hereto as <b>Exhibit I</b> is a true and			
9	correct copy of the Court's December 22, 2016 Minute		•	
10	Order denying DCA's application for preliminary			
11	injunction.			
12	Dated: February 1, 2017	Jo	nes Day	$\cap$
13		(		<u> </u>
14		Ву	Jeffrey Alle Vee	
15		At	torneys for Defendant	ron.
16			TER <del>NET C</del> ORPORATION F SSIGNED NAMES AND NU	
17 18				
19				
20				
21				
22				,
23				
24				į
25				
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>				
28				
		_		

## PROOF OF SERVICE 1 I, Diane Sanchez, declare: 2 I am a citizen of the United States and employed in Los Angeles County, California. I am 3 over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address 4 is 555 South Flower Street, Fiftieth Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071.2300. On February 1, 5 2017, I served a copy of the within document(s): 6 ICANN'S RESPONSES TO DCA'S EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE 7 **DECLARATION OF JEFFREY A. LEVEE** 8 by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California addressed as set 9 forth below. 10 by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed Federal Express envelope and affixing a pre-paid air bill, and causing the envelope to be delivered to a Delivery 11 Service agent for delivery. 12 by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the 13 address(es) set forth below. 14 by transmitting via e-mail or electronic transmission the document(s) listed above × to the person(s) at the e-mail address(es) set forth below. 15 16 David W. Kesselman, Esq. Ethan J. Brown Kesselman Brantly Stockinger LLP ethan@bnslawgroup.com 1230 Rosecrans Ave, Suite 690 17 Sara C. Colón Manhattan Beach, CA 90266 sara@bnslawgroup.com Rowennakete "Kete" Barnes (310) 307-4556 18 (310) 307-4570 fax kete@bnsklaw.com dkesselman@kbslaw.com 19 **BROWN NERI & SMITH LLP** 11766 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1670 Los Angeles, California 90025 20 Telephone: (310) 593-9890 21 I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose 22 direction the service was made. 23

Executed on February 1, 2017, at Los Angeles, California.

Diane Sanchez

NAI-1501037652v2

28

24

25

26

27