

# Rebuttal

Note: Please read my main evidence [1] first if you have not already done so.

This is a rebuttal to the latest evidence from the challenger, copied below:

I plea jurors follow Case & Policy law

Already binding cases: #687 & #664.

As Policy states "The sign should display in a readable manner the full Ethereum address of the submitter (No ENS; no ellipsis)."

As recognized by the other party, the address displayed: ETHaddress+(any non hexa ch).

Transparency/coherence: I plea jurors vote NO

Submitted By: 0xBd50...728e

26 May 2021 12:17 UTC

To clarify and to save the jurors some work, cases 687 and 664 are both cases where the users accidentally added a 'y' after their addresses.

First of all, there is no such concept as "binding cases" in Kleros, whatever that may mean (but feel free to read through the General Court rules again to convince yourself (see appendix)). Precedent (and certainly not "binding cases") only exists in Kleros insofar that the larger a body of jurors has voted coherently on an issue, the less likely it is that future appeals which contradict that precedent will be likely to succeed. *This is of course assuming that no novel and compelling evidence is submitted.* In this case, we only have two cases with no appeals and basically no argumentation as precedent.

Now, if we look at the juror justifications for case 687, we can see that one of the justifications was as follows (emphasis added):

Although **I do not think that the address itself is at issue**, I do see a multitude of other issues:

1. The address is not displayed alongside the submitter but beforehand.
2. The sound is very muddled (and there are other people speaking in the background).
3. The submitter is not quite facing the camera in the profile picture.
4. The lighting in the profile picture is very bright and uneven which can be distracting (especially to algorithms).

It might be that none of these would be enough to disqualify the profile taken on their own, but taken together, they make this profile hard to defend. I honestly do not understand why anyone providing such a sizeable deposit would put in so little effort and submit such a sloppy profile.

Regarding the other jurors' justifications (for those who gave one), they are all simply that the address does not match, and no compelling argumentation was submitted at the time. Considering how little thought was given to the matter (by the jury and the concerned parties) in cases 687 and

664, I think it is safe to say that they do not constitute precedents worth considering and therefore that only the new arguments I have presented [1] as well as any counter-arguments which may be presented by the challenger's side (which is to say none at all at this point in time) should be taken into consideration.

To reiterate the point I have made in my main piece of evidence [1] (please read it), a non-hexadecimal character (not 0-9 or a-f) appearing after the address cannot cause any confusion and there is no rule against displaying other text alongside the address ("The sign should display in a readable manner the full Ethereum address of the submitter (No ENS; no ellipsis)."), and as such rejecting this submission would constitute an over-interpretation of the rules on the part of the jury, thus undermining the credibility of Kleros as an unbiased arbitrator.

[1] <https://ipfs.kleros.io/ipfs/QmQsGxSANKxhuT7oiGR2DZ7hUhixK8caqV4AwgqyVnw1UL/712yes.pdf>

## Appendix: General Court rules

### Court Purpose

The General court exists as the top court in the hierarchy. All appeals made in subcourts will make their way to the General Court.

**Guidelines:** All policies of a court also apply to all of its child subcourts. Jurors should cast their vote with a suitable verification. Jurors should not rule in favor of a side who have engaged in immoral activities (example: rule reject on "revenge porn" images even if they would otherwise fit into the category). "Refuse to arbitrate" should be used for disputes where both sides of the dispute have engaged in activities which are immoral (ex: refuse to rule on an assassination market dispute). Immoral activities include: Murder, slavery, rape, violence, theft and perjury. Rulings should be made based on the "state of the world" at the time a dispute was created. (Ex: in a dispute concerning membership of a smart contract on a curated list of "bug free" contracts, jurors should not take into account changes made to the contract after the dispute is raised.) In particular, jurors should base their rulings on court policies and arbitrable application primary documents as they exist at the time of the creation of the dispute, disregarding later modifications. To ensure fairness to jurors who vote at different times within a voting period, jurors should disregard any evidence that is both 1) submitted after the end of the evidence period of the initial round of a dispute AND 2) cannot be reasonably considered to have been readily, publicly available to jurors. Jurors may, however, consider arguments that are submitted later that are based upon existing evidence and/or information which a juror considering the case during the evidence period of the initial round could reasonably have been expected to find themselves. (Ex: a party submits a new photo of a damaged product in an insurance case after the evidence period; this photo should not be considered by jurors. Ex: in a dispute over whether a token satisfies the criteria of a curated list of ERC20 tokens, an argument that reminds jurors of a definitional element of the ERC20 standard is submitted; this is publicly available and can be considered by jurors. Ex: in a dispute over whether a token satisfies a decentralization criterion for an exchange listing, an argument that invokes the distribution of tokens over different Ethereum addresses, as publicly available from sites such as Etherscan, can be considered by jurors.) When considering an appeal of a case that has originated in a lower court, jurors should consider whether 1) evaluating the case requires specialized skills which jurors in the appellate court cannot be expected to have (ex: evaluating the quality of an English to Korean

translation when knowledge of Korean is not a requirement of the appellate court) and 2) whether there is evidence that an attack was performed against this case in the lower court (ex: bribes, p+epsilon attacks, 51% attacks, etc). If there is no evidence of an attack AND appellate court jurors cannot be reasonably expected to have the required skills to independently evaluate the case, jurors should vote to uphold the lower court ruling. Evidence related to the presence of attacks on Kleros should be considered by jurors even if it would otherwise violate the above points on evidence admissibility. Jurors should attempt to interpret disputes according to the “spirit of the dispute” unless the arbitrable contract or the policies of the subcourt state otherwise. Jurors should interpret disputes without assuming the existence of gods, spirits or other supernatural beings unless the arbitrable contract or the policies of the subcourt state otherwise.