

**Dispute #703:** <https://court.kleros.io/cases/703>

**Profile:**

<https://app.proofofhumanity.id/profile/0xebb0dd8af6446f51d1c985a0672e9fd9ab9931d6>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Dear Jurors,**

It is my intention with the evidence I am submitting to convince you to rule in my favor and dismiss the challenge made to me. It is clear that the intention of the person that challenged me is not to curate Proof of Humanity list, nor let PoH grow, but to have an economic return. This ruling cannot set precedent where a bad actor has clear intentions to harm me and open the floodgates for future disputes about this technical issue.

When I proceeded with my registration, I uploaded my video sharing it previously via WhatsApp to check content and that was the reason why, when uploading the last version, it was compressed and cropped 640x288 pixels. ***It is clear that, even with a few pixels cropped, I am still a human.***

I want to remind everyone that the last objective of this registry is to prevent Sybil attacks, and the challenge to me does not contribute in any aspect to that end. Let it serve as a precedent, that this court can demonstrate empathy and solidarity which are the values that found Kleros and Proof of Humanity, not getting carried away by loopholes by opportunists to have an economic return at the expense of humans that saved a lot to make a deposit and be part of Proof of Humanity.

Clément Lesaege, CTO of Kleros says in his candidacy to become a delegate that:

"I believe proof of humanity to be a very important tool for web3 sybil resistance which can allow better distribution of both wealth and influence by using systems such as 1 person → 1 vote, 1 person → 1 revenue stream and those related to quadratic funding/voting."

If we talk about a better distribution of both wealth and influence, what is being shown to the system that the distribution of opportunities for people is being influenced by opportunism driven by money

In the description of this court, we find the following text: "*In this court jurors will judge disputes related to establishing Sybil resistant lists of unique human identities, particularly for the Proof of Humanity protocol.*"

***I consider it necessary to point out that the pixels difference (made by Android for their encoding method) does not obstruct in any way my facial features nor any letter of my ETH address. Let's keep an eye that the video complies to demonstrate that I am a real human.***

Does the challenger imagine how extremely complex it is to save 800usd? Do they know how difficult it is for a delivery guy to save this amount of money? Can you have such disrespect for someone else without thinking of the consequences of it?

***It is impossible to consider even for one moment that the challenger is doing this to help Proof of Humanity be more secure.***

Getting into the legal aspect, it is known that every norm is subject to interpretation: *It is needed to understand the content, some context to provide a meaning.* To interpret is an activity always developed while understanding the context.

This challenge is clearly someone taking advantage. The context explained above should be taken into account. From a natural law point of view (considering that rules and rights are part of human nature and preceded any other law), we are in front of the possibility that this court, being the end of this video to prove my humanity, can consider that 36 pixels from both sides should not be evidence enough to challenge my profile and rule in favor of this challenger. ***It is, once again, about being human.***

It is demonstrated that a positive understanding of the rules (detailed and literal, without any change to debate about it) opens the doors to a speculating game that does not favor the spirit of this project and enables situations that will certainly not help PoH.

I do want to overlook that I am not against the rules, I understand that Challengers are a critical part of the process and economic incentives are needed, ***but I consider this case is fundamental to lay jurisprudence about the importance of curating a list, and do not give chance to this kind of opportunism.***

***The challenger should have the focus in curating the list with real humans, and not look for this technicism to take the deposit from someone else.***

If this court accepts this behavior will legitimate opportunists and challengers looking for money and not to curate the list. PoH is a project being developed and for it to be successful, this kind of behaviour should not be tolerated. This will also help to improve the interface. I hope this Court rules in my favour and not for someone taking advantage of a misinterpretation of what 360p actually is.

Let it not put itself in the place of the callous.

Let opportunism disguised as justice not be legitimized.