

1 **NEWMAN & NEWMAN, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLP**  
Derek A. Newman (190467)  
2 S. Christopher Winter (190474)  
Venkat Balasubramani (189192)  
3 505 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 610  
Seattle, WA 98104  
4 Telephone: (206) 274-2800  
Facsimile: (206) 274-2801

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
6  
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10  
11 **REGISTERSITE.COM, an Assumed**  
Name of **ABR PRODUCTS INC.**, a  
12 New York Corporation, *et al.*,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 **INTERNET CORPORATION FOR**  
**ASSIGNED NAMES AND**  
16 **NUMBERS**, a California corporation,  
*et al.*,

17 Defendants.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. CV 04-1368 ABC (CWx)

Hon. Audrey B. Collins

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO**  
**DEFENDANT VERISIGN'S**  
**MOTION TO DISMISS**  
**PLAINTIFFS' ELEVENTH CLAIM**  
**FOR RELIEF FOR IMPROPER**  
**VENUE**

DATE: July 12, 2004  
TIME: 10:00 a.m.  
COURTROOM: Room 680 –  
Roybal Bldg.

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**SUPREME COURT CASES**

Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc. v. Shute,  
499 U.S. 585, 111 S.Ct. 1522, 113 L.Ed.2d 622 (1991) ..... 15

United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs,  
383 U.S. 715, 86 S.Ct. 1130, 16 L.Ed.2d 218 (1966) ..... 10, 12-14

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASES**

Argueta v. Banco Mexicano, S.A.,  
87 F.3d 320 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) ..... 9

Bonner Mall Partnership  
2 F.3d 899 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) ..... 13

Murphy v. Schneider Nat'l, Inc.,  
362 F.3d 1133 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) ..... 16

Sequoia Insurance Co. v. Royal Insurance Co. of America,  
971 F.2d 1385 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) ..... 13

**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CASES**

Lopez v. Martin Luther King Jr. Hospital,  
97 F.R.D. 24 (C.D.Cal. 1983) ..... 13, 14

Tokio Marine & Fire Ins. Co. v. Nippon Express U.S.A. (Illinois), Inc.,  
118 F.Supp.2d 997 (C.D.Cal. 2000) ..... 14

**OTHER FEDERAL CASES**

Ciolino v. Ryan,  
2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11639, \*19 (N.D.Cal. 2003) ..... 14

Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp. v. Geldermann, Inc.,  
1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16395, \*7 (W.D.Okla. 1989) ..... 10, 11

Lundy v. Morgan Stanley & Co.,  
1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18207 (N.D.Cal. 1991) ..... 14

Pacer Global Logistics, Inc. v. Nat'l Passenger Railroad Corp.,  
272 F.Supp.2d 784 (E.D.Wisc. 2003) ..... 15

Serpico v. Laborers' Int'l Union of North America,  
1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11237, \*14-15 (N.D.Ill. 1995) ..... 10

Vogt-Nem, Inc. v. M/V Tramper,  
263 F.Supp.2d 1226 (N.D.Cal. 2002) ..... 14

1 **STATE CASES**

2  
3 Ex parte Leasecomm Corp.,  
2003 Ala. Lexis 356, \*12 (Ala. 2003) ..... 9, 10  
4 Personalized Marketing Service, Inc. v. Stotler & Co.,  
447 N.W.2d 447 (Minn.Ct.App. 1989) ..... 11  
5

6 **STATUTES AND RULES**

7 15 U.S.C. § 41 ..... 7  
8 15 U.S.C. §1 ..... 7  
9 CAL. BUS. & PROF. §17200 ..... 6  
10 CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750 ..... 6  
11 CAL. CIV. CODE § 1770 ..... 6  
12 FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(3) ..... 4, 15  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1**
- II. FACTS ..... 2**
  - A. The Contracts Between the Parties Require Claims Relating to ICANN to Be Brought in Los Angeles ..... 2
    - 1. ICANN’s Contracts with Verisign Require California Venue for Lawsuits Concerning the WLS. .... 2
    - 2. ICANN’s Contracts with Plaintiffs Require California Venue. .... 3
    - 3. Verisign’s Breach of Contract and its Forum Selection Clause ..... 4
  - B. Verisign must Litigate the Three Claims Against Both it and ICANN in this Forum ..... 4
  - C. The Remaining Causes of Action Require the Same Factual Determination as the Claim Verisign Seeks to Transfer ..... 6
    - 1. The Eleventh Cause of Action Relates to Verisign’s Right to Ignore Plaintiffs’ Requests to Delete Domain Names ..... 6
    - 2. All Other Claims Against Verisign Similarly Relate to Verisign’s Right to Ignore Plaintiffs’ Requests to Delete Domain Names ..... 6
- III. ARGUMENT ..... 8**
  - A. Public Policy Strongly Favors California Venue for All Claims. .... 9
    - 1. In Order to Maintain a Single Venue for Related Claims, Courts Regularly Decline to Enforce Forum Selection Clauses ..... 9
    - 2. The Supreme Court, Ninth Circuit, and Central District of California Encourage a Single Forum for a Single Controversy to Promote Judicial Economy ..... 12
    - 3. The Claims in this Case Should Be Considered a Single Cause of Action for Venue Purposes ..... 15
  - B. All Factual Disputes Must Be Resolved in Plaintiffs’ Favor. .... 15
- IV. CONCLUSION ..... 16**