Case 408

So far, no attempt has been made by challenger party to answer “most commonly used name” clause. Still, requester party 2nd pdf explained why is acceptable to claim “Growth DeFi” is the most commonly used name, points that have not seen any attempt to be debunked. Challenger has decided the whole case around “brand name”, yet the project is listed as “Growth DeFi” by reputable non-official external sources.

This gives the impression challenger is trying to saturate Evidence by filling it with information, as explained by ad-nauseam fallacy, so that jurors believe this case is unclear enough and, as default, feel they are compelled to vote no.

All points are being made around unfinished REBASE case. Challenger agrees Policy > Case Law (challenger 1st pdf), yet is building the arguments around previous cases.

This last document will quote arguments from challenger 1st pdf and attack them individually using color coding:

>There are some coin trackers using GROWTH DeFi, but CoinMarketCap and CoinGecko are the most relevant trackers of course. If you type “growth defi” into Google you can find quite some of them.

1. That only gets to the surface of the argument. Why should we consider those trackers given that they have low exposure? If you want this to be a compelling argument, you would need to make a list of “GROWTH DeFi” trackers, along with their popularity or revelancy, like it was done in requester’s party 2nd pdf.

>Just because it is not literally mentioned in the Policy that the branding style of a name should be respected, does not mean that we shouldn’t. There is also something called common sense, it wouldn’t make sense to use gRoWtH dEfI as the name for this submission for instance. For that reason, EncrypGen, OVCODE, SpankChain, Zebi, and DAOstack all got rejected once for using incorrect capitalization. Additionally, these cases set a precedent for using correct letter capitalization.

1. If Policy does not clarify some characteristic as undesirable, default is too add it, as the clauses in Policy are exclusive, this means, they list undesirable characteristics so that jurors identify them as exclude the submission. So no, you cannot arbitrarily make up new exclusions.
2. Common sense must not be so precious if it guides to an erroneus conclusion. Still, it is true it wouldn’t make sense to list it as gRoWtH dEfI, but this is an exageration. Growth DeFi is the submission. Does common sense also attack “Growth DeFi”?
3. Cases do not set precedents, Policy > Case Law.

Case law shouldn’t be ignored. I agree that policy > case law, however in the absence of specific rules in the policy, case law is of utmost importance. When a policy is not well enough defined, disputes can arise where jurors have to rule based on common sense and subjectivity. Regarding

letter capitalization, this has happened at least 5 times in the past. EncrypGen, OVCODE, SpankChain, Zebi, and DAOstack all got rejected, even though there was no specific rule about letter capitalization in the policy. Up until now, letter capitalization has always been respected in the T2CR. REBASE is the most recent dispute, which was challenged because of supposed incorrect letter casing. The jury currently ruled to respect REBASE's official brand style, meaning that if the jurors in this case choose to not respect GROWTH DeFi's brand style, contradicting rulings would be given. This should be avoided at all costs, as it would undermine the trustworthiness of the Kleros resolution system. If the appealing party (requester's side of this case) truly believe that the official project's brand style should not be respected, they should put their money where their mouth is and fund for an appeal in the REBASE dispute. Failing to appeal the decision of the jury to respect REBASE's brand style will set a precedent. A project's official spelling (including letter casing), should be respected. Jurisprudence regarding correct letter capitalization already existed before the REBASE case, so the ruling of the REBASE case will strengthen existing case law even further.

(Not related to Growth DeFi arguments are being deliberately ignored as to focus on this case)

1. In the absence of specific exclutionary rules, default is to add to T2CR. If the Curate List does not desire those entries, then Policy is to evolve based on those exceptions.
2. Capitalization is being respected here on the requester's party's arguments too, it's just not necesarily the one in the branding of the project. You are (deliberately) confusing between respecting capitalization of most commonly used name and capitalization of brand name.
3. Trustworthiness is not necessarily dependant on constant and similar solutions to similar problems. If a wrong solution was given before, would it be trustworthy to commit the same mistake again?
4. The author of this document does not fund the appeal in the REBASE dispute for these reasons: he does not have enough funds to do so, and he is not informed on that case, nor should he be, as they are different cases.
5. As long as that precedent is manifested as changes in the Policy to specify new non-contemplated situations, there is no issue.
6. A project's official spelling is to be respected as stated in clause three. However, why should letter casing be the same as official spelling? That is not in the Policy, only most commonly used name is contemplated.

The correct spelling, as dictated by the project owners, is GROWTH DeFi. So, the answer to your question is that such tokens should be listed in the T2CR using the official name. It's logical that not the whole community is always typing GROWTH DeFi in full and in capital letters. Just typing GRO or Growth is much faster and easier, therefore many will write it not in all caps on places like Telegram. As you said, there is no consensus around a different spelling of GROWTH DeFi, thus according to the policy, names should be treated like brand names.

1. Let's refer to this statement as A.
2. Let's refer to this statement as B. Does A -> B? Why? A is indeed true as it is specified in clause three, but B is not necessarily a consequence of A. This can be proven the

following way: Let's say a project if officially branded as X, but commonly referred by communities and listed in trackers as Y. X and Y have the same spelling, but distinct capitalization. If the token was submitted as X in T2CR, a proper examination would be "X has the same spelling as brand name, so it passes clause three, but it has distinct capitalization as most commonly used name, so it fails clause one, and thus, should be rejected." Thus, it is proven A -> B is false.

3. If it is logical that the most commonly used name is not the brand name, because it is easier to refer to...
4. How do you come up with this? There is no consensus, but that is not a necessary condition for a capitalization to be "most commonly used name". (Example) If 99% used "Growth DeFi" and 1% used "GROWTH DeFi", there would be no consensus but yet "Growth DeFi" would qualify as most commonly used name.

There is no point on spending further gas, as information is already saturated. Note to jurors, do not just accept these arguments or challenger's arguments because they are most frequent (review ad-nauseam fallacy), just do a best attempt to break them logically, follow the Policy, do your research and dismiss distractions. It is not wise to feel threatened by previous disputes' results.