

Kleros Court - Marketing Services Subcourt - Case No. 328

Claimant's Brief for First Appeal

Time Anywhere on Earth is the Logic One

If the time zone is "irrelevant" as argued, then [Anywhere on Earth time](#) (or time for eligible participants) is reasonable for the time frame to avoid any argument or harm by the drafter's omission of a time zone. **The imposition of a specific time zone must be irrelevant, else Respondent would have specified it in the terms it drafted.** The opposition failed to respond with any term or official court policy for UTC, despite this point being raised in the previous brief.

A whale juror making it up after the fact would undermine the separation of powers (between parties agreeing to certain terms, court governance voters and jurors). This would reduce the ability to conduct contractual relationships or to judge with predictability if any condition can be added in a later dictatorial, unilateral statement. **Future arguments could invent any unspecified limitations as "logic" similarly to how the "no" side in case 302 unsuccessfully assumed limiting Statnews was logic. Further, the opposition failed to counter Claimant's argument of contractual interpretation in his favor as he did not draft the Program Terms and was never put on notice of a UTC condition.**

This interpretation on publication does not create a conflict between different time zones or VPNs because there was one submission deadline which was accurately specified (i.e., one week before the distribution date, which Respondent missed by the way). It was fair enough to expect the time frame could pass for participants wherever located and then submissions would be taken with that deadline. Anyway, such a conflict scenario is unlikely in the future because the Kleros Coop started specifying UTC in other documents, something that was not applicable in the Program Terms here.

The Timestamps Are Trust-minimized

The opposition paraphrasing the argument as "please trust me, it was still the 10th Jan" is incorrect. **The Claimant relies on the time held by Medium for the publication and by the Kleros Coop on its Google spreadsheet for the submission.** Claimant has not changed the Medium date, nor does it even appear possible. It would be a speculative feature the opposition fails to demonstrate. On his end, Claimant did submit local screenshots showing "Jan 10" *and* how their validity can be verified with a proxy. (See previous [Reply Brief](#) at page 1, section 2.)

Clarifications for the Jurors

The previous paragraph also addresses the first juror question if it's about the publication time. The screenshots linked to in the previous brief are not meant as the proof alone, but

what is shown is the time held by Medium and the note that this is replicable with a Western proxy.

Regarding the jurisprudence showing the publication time should be considered in local time, [Kleros Court Case No. 166](#) was mentioned in the initial dispute description, but more clarity is needed about how it applies for the time question. **It was basically the same dispute except for a publication in the second time frame, resolved in Claimant's favor.** The issue that Medium was showing a different date according to the time zone was not even pointed out and argued, but the Kleros Coop had acknowledged notice of the case, had agreed to it, and did not oppose it. (See [notice](#) and [final judgment](#).) The reason it is discussed now is because a *third party* belatedly raises it quite hostilely although *the parties* had finally settled this issue in case 166 -- a heated argument that would traditionally not be entertained.

The General Court Would Be Called to Follow the Jurisprudence

The jurors-for-court-jump parameter in this subcourt was updated from 255 to 15 [in August 2019](#). This means, despite someone's attempt to intimidate and possibly control this subcourt, **this case is set to soon jump to the General Court in appeals.** Because there are many jurors staking many pinakions there, it should be more likely to follow the rational argument and the jurisprudence of cases 166 and 302 by voting "yes" without interference.

Enjoy one of your easiest cases where the jurisprudence and logic clearly support the Claimant. Vote "yes."