Challenge types matter and their definitions are very clear. Incorrect Submission challenges do not include cases of submitters attempting an attack to the registry, no matter whether they are willful or guilty. "A challenge can be rejected if the challenge type specified is incorrect".

As explained in cases 829, 830, 831 and 834 and then admitted in the Manifesto of the Cryptoevangelist by the wrongdoer, many profiles including this one are managed by one (or two) person. This person failed to provide a proof of life for most challenged profiles. The first-round verdicts of the Humanity Court at the time of writing are aligned with this accusation. For example, in case 834 a proof of life was submitted, where Hermin is clearly visible showing a blockhash. Nevertheless, this is not enough evidence to counter-argument the duplicate challenge.

Regarding the 2 previous pieces of evidence:

- "It could not do it because it is dead or does not have access to the Ethereum address. As the registration policy says: "Submitters not able to give recent proof of life are to be considered deceased". Therefore the request to register should not be accepted". If this argument was valid, then the current challenge should be rejected in favor of the "Deceased" type challenge.
- "At first, this submission is being manipulated by a third person for their own benefit to collect UBI. For this reason, in the entire challenge process, “ElGato” could not demonstrate that it is alive as required by the registration policy. Either because he doesn't have access to his Ethereum address or because he's just dead". Precisely this is an argument in favor of the "Duplicate" challenge type, maybe in favor of the "Deceased" type, but by no means supports the "Incorrect Submission" type.

Not only is the current challenge type wrong according to the written policy, but it also decreases the security of the registry by not removing the malicious voucher. If this challenge is accepted, it could create a precedent that allows attackers to front-run "Duplicate" challenges with "Incorrect Submission" challenges in order to dodge the major punishment.

I leave you with a quote by Mr Clément Lesaege, CTO of Kleros, where the importance of the Duplicate/Fake challenge type is explained.