

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury,

Below is the list of violations of the removal request:

- ***“The name should be the most commonly used name to refer to the asset”***
- ***“Suffixes such as, but not limited to: “Token”, “Coin” should generally be avoided, unless a name with suffix is already well established”***
- ***“Names should be treated like brand names (spelling wise). This means that the correct spelling is dictated by the project owners, unless consensus forms around a different spelling”***

Arbitrarily renaming it for distinction will create an incorrect standard for ruling on future, parallel cases. To spare you the audacity and pretentious sympathy of the requester to users written on Case 536, he basically blamed Aave – project owners – for not making that obvious distinction and put the blame to the policy of the court for not adjusting to his selfless intent.

We can verify from coin aggregators and exchanges that version 1 tokens name did not change. No consensus was formed for a different spelling.

Adding v1 or v2 can fall in the category of suffixes and clearly, this is not well established for version 1 tokens. YAM does have this distinction (amongst DEFI) and is established on coin aggregators - doesn't mean Aave must follow.

- ***“Contract addresses are an attack vector and should be checked carefully”***
- ***“In case of duplicates, only the first submission should be accepted. The most recent submissions appear highest in the list”***

Version 1 and version 2 tokens have different contract address, thereby duplicate line isn't violated and essentially making each tokens distinct from one another. Requester doesn't seem to know much of Uniswap and disregards verification of contract address when transacting and the option to search using contract address, even if you have only chosen a particular list to enable. (indirectly undermining the capacity of the users doing diligence before using a protocol) Also, on the early weeks of dispute, [name doesn't appear in the integration](#) making additional name insertion ineffective.

At least one of violations in the policy merits rejection of a request. If we willingly permit deviation from the policy, then we'd have chaos in court as anything becomes permissible. Submitting evidence to support or disprove a claim becomes purposeless. Whichever is deficient or whichever improvement is needed, it must go through governance. Use your PNK to vote.

Let me be clear, I don't discourage adding Aave version 2 tokens.

Last but not the least, since ~ e510fbc so profusely accuse me of selfishness and lack of common sense, reading between the lines of the YES commenters on Case 536 and you'd know removal is not for common good but to feed their greed.

[For each token successfully removed or registered, you get 1000 PNK.](#) How many Aave tokens do they want to remove and resubmit? That's 1000 x 2 for each token. Splendid!

His highborn's argument incites community members to turn against the opposing party, encourage disorder and lose trust to the platform creators themselves.

Four cases (536,537,538,539) of two wins and two losses should had been sufficient to get the message across to the team for both parties -for one, appeals must have limit and juror selection must be fine tuned - yet, out of greed, appeals even Case 539 with 'NO' majority in all rounds.

"Divisiveness leads to a lot of things. Rarely are any of them good." — Germany Kent