#### **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

## **FILED**

#### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 15 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RUBY GLEN, LLC,

No. 16-56890

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No.

2:16-cv-05505-PA-AS

V.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS and DOES, 1-10,

MEMORANDUM\*

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Central District of California Percy Anderson, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted October 9, 2018 Pasadena, California

Before: SCHROEDER, M. SMITH, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Ruby Glen, LLC ("Ruby Glen") appeals the district court's dismissal of its First Amended Complaint ("FAC") against Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN"). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. "We review de novo dismissals for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6)."

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

*McKesson HBOC, Inc. v. N.Y. State Common Ret. Fund, Inc.*, 339 F.3d 1087, 1090 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed the FAC on the ground that Ruby Glen's claims are barred by the covenant not to sue contained in the Applicant Guidebook. As the district court found, the covenant not to sue is not void under California Civil Code section 1668. Ruby Glen is not without recourse—it can challenge ICANN's actions through the Independent Review Process, which Ruby Glen concedes "is effectively an arbitration, operated by the International Centre for Dispute Resolution of the American Arbitration Association, comprised of an independent panel of arbitrators." Thus, the covenant not to sue does not exempt ICANN from liability, but instead is akin to an alternative dispute resolution agreement falling outside the scope of section 1668. See Cal. Civ. Code. § 1668 ("All contracts which have for their object . . . to exempt anyone from responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury . . . , or violation of law . . . are against the policy of the law." (emphasis added)); see also Cont'l Airlines, Inc. v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., 819 F.2d 1519, 1527 (9th Cir. 1987) (holding that an "exculpatory clause" does not violate California Civil Code section 1668 where the clause bars suit, but "[o]ther sanctions remain in place"); Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc., 473 U.S. 614, 628 (1985) ("By agreeing to

arbitrate . . . , a party does not forgo [its] substantive rights . . . ; it only submits to their resolution in an arbitral, rather than a judicial, forum.").

The district court also properly rejected Ruby Glen's argument that the covenant not to sue is unconscionable. Even assuming that the adhesive nature of the Guidebook renders the covenant not to sue procedurally unconscionable, it is not substantively unconscionable. See Sanchez v. Valencia Holding Co., 61 Cal. 4th 899, 910 (2015) (explaining that procedural and substantive unconscionability "must both be present in order for a court to exercise its discretion to refuse to enforce a contract or clause under the doctrine of unconscionability" (emphasis in original) (internal quotation marks omitted)); Grand Prospect Partners, L.P. v. Ross Dress for Less, Inc., 232 Cal. App. 4th 1332, 1347–48 (2015) (holding that procedural unconscionability "may be established by showing the contract is one of adhesion"). Because Ruby Glen may pursue its claims through the Independent Review Process, the covenant not to sue is not "so one-sided as to shock the conscience." See Walnut Producers of Cal. v. Diamond Foods, Inc., 187 Cal. App. 4th 634, 647–48 (2010) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Finally, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Ruby Glen leave to amend because any amendment would have been futile. *See Carrico v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, 656 F.3d 1002, 1008 (9th Cir. 2011).<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ruby Glen raises several additional arguments that it failed to raise below. We decline to consider those arguments because they were raised for the first time on appeal. *See Dream Palace v. Cty. of Maricopa*, 384 F.3d 990, 1005 (9th Cir. 2004).

#### **United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit**

#### Office of the Clerk

95 Seventh Street San Francisco, CA 94103

## **Information Regarding Judgment and Post-Judgment Proceedings**

#### **Judgment**

• This Court has filed and entered the attached judgment in your case. Fed. R. App. P. 36. Please note the filed date on the attached decision because all of the dates described below run from that date, not from the date you receive this notice.

#### Mandate (Fed. R. App. P. 41; 9th Cir. R. 41-1 & -2)

• The mandate will issue 7 days after the expiration of the time for filing a petition for rehearing or 7 days from the denial of a petition for rehearing, unless the Court directs otherwise. To file a motion to stay the mandate, file it electronically via the appellate ECF system or, if you are a pro se litigant or an attorney with an exemption from using appellate ECF, file one original motion on paper.

## Petition for Panel Rehearing (Fed. R. App. P. 40; 9th Cir. R. 40-1) Petition for Rehearing En Banc (Fed. R. App. P. 35; 9th Cir. R. 35-1 to -3)

## (1) A. Purpose (Panel Rehearing):

- A party should seek panel rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:
  - ► A material point of fact or law was overlooked in the decision;
  - A change in the law occurred after the case was submitted which appears to have been overlooked by the panel; or
  - An apparent conflict with another decision of the Court was not addressed in the opinion.
- Do not file a petition for panel rehearing merely to reargue the case.

## **B.** Purpose (Rehearing En Banc)

• A party should seek en banc rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:

- ► Consideration by the full Court is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions; or
- ► The proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance; or
- The opinion directly conflicts with an existing opinion by another court of appeals or the Supreme Court and substantially affects a rule of national application in which there is an overriding need for national uniformity.

#### (2) Deadlines for Filing:

- A petition for rehearing may be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party in a civil case, the time for filing a petition for rehearing is 45 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the mandate has issued, the petition for rehearing should be accompanied by a motion to recall the mandate.
- See Advisory Note to 9th Cir. R. 40-1 (petitions must be received on the due date).
- An order to publish a previously unpublished memorandum disposition extends the time to file a petition for rehearing to 14 days after the date of the order of publication or, in all civil cases in which the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party, 45 days after the date of the order of publication. 9th Cir. R. 40-2.

#### (3) Statement of Counsel

• A petition should contain an introduction stating that, in counsel's judgment, one or more of the situations described in the "purpose" section above exist. The points to be raised must be stated clearly.

## (4) Form & Number of Copies (9th Cir. R. 40-1; Fed. R. App. P. 32(c)(2))

- The petition shall not exceed 15 pages unless it complies with the alternative length limitations of 4,200 words or 390 lines of text.
- The petition must be accompanied by a copy of the panel's decision being challenged.
- An answer, when ordered by the Court, shall comply with the same length limitations as the petition.
- If a pro se litigant elects to file a form brief pursuant to Circuit Rule 28-1, a petition for panel rehearing or for rehearing en banc need not comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32.

### Case: 16-56890, 10/15/2018, ID: 11046363, DktEntry: 53-2, Page 3 of 5

- The petition or answer must be accompanied by a Certificate of Compliance found at Form 11, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.
- You may file a petition electronically via the appellate ECF system. No paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise. If you are a pro se litigant or an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, file one original petition on paper. No additional paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise.

#### Bill of Costs (Fed. R. App. P. 39, 9th Cir. R. 39-1)

- The Bill of Costs must be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment.
- See Form 10 for additional information, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.

#### **Attorneys Fees**

- Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1 describes the content and due dates for attorneys fees applications.
- All relevant forms are available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms* or by telephoning (415) 355-7806.

#### **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari**

• Please refer to the Rules of the United States Supreme Court at www.supremecourt.gov

## **Counsel Listing in Published Opinions**

- Please check counsel listing on the attached decision.
- If there are any errors in a published <u>opinion</u>, please send a letter **in writing** within 10 days to:
  - ► Thomson Reuters; 610 Opperman Drive; PO Box 64526; Eagan, MN 55123 (Attn: Jean Green, Senior Publications Coordinator);
  - ▶ and electronically file a copy of the letter via the appellate ECF system by using "File Correspondence to Court," or if you are an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, mail the Court one copy of the letter.

#### **United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit**

#### **BILL OF COSTS**

This form is available as a fillable version at: http://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/uploads/forms/Form%2010%20-%20Bill%20of%20Costs.pdf.

<b>Note:</b> If you wish to f service, within late bill of costs U.S.C. § 1920,	14 days of s must be a	the date of ccompanie	entry of judd by a moti	dgment, and in a	accordance od cause. P	e with 9th Please refe	Circuit Ru	le 39-1. A
		v.				9th	Cir. No.	
The Clerk is reque	sted to tax	the followi	ng costs ag	ainst:				
Cost Taxable under FRAP 39, 28 U.S.C. § 1920, 9th Cir. R. 39-1	(Eac	-	UESTED Must Be Co	ompleted)	<b>ALLOWED</b> (To Be Completed by the Clerk)			
	No. of Docs.	Pages per Doc.	Cost per Page*	TOTAL COST	No. of Docs.	Pages per Doc.	Cost per Page*	TOTAL COST
Excerpt of Record			\$	\$			\$	\$
Opening Brief			\$	\$			\$	\$
Answering Brief			\$	\$			\$	\$
Reply Brief			\$	\$			\$	\$
Other**			\$	\$			\$	\$
TOTAL				¢ [			ТОТАТ	¢ [

Attorneys' fees **cannot** be requested on this form.

<sup>\*</sup> Costs per page: May not exceed .10 or actual cost, whichever is less. 9th Circuit Rule 39-1.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Other: Any other requests must be accompanied by a statement explaining why the item(s) should be taxed pursuant to 9th Circuit Rule 39-1. Additional items without such supporting statements will not be considered.

# Case: 16-56890, 10/15/2018, ID: 11046363, DktEntry: 53-2, Page 5 of 5 Form 10. Bill of Costs - Continued

I, were actually and necessarily performed,	, swear under penalty of perjury that the services for which costs are taxed and that the requested costs were actually expended as listed.
Signature  ("s/" plus attorney's name if submitted ele	ectronically)
Name of Counsel:	
Attorney for:	
(To Be Completed by the Clerk)  Date	Costs are taxed in the amount of \$
	Clerk of Court  By: , Deputy Clerk