

The submission of the KRL token developed by the KRYLL project was challenged on the grounds that the logo did not match the real logo.



Logo submitted >>>

This challenge is totally abusive because:

- **1° first of all**, the challenger does not in any way prove the inaccuracy of the logo; however, the proof lies with the prosecution, otherwise we would be living in a totalitarian system where everyone can be suspected of anything; the argument put forward by the Challenger is totally fallacious because the logo it uses is that of the mobile application, as mentioned in the media kit.
- **2° then**, the submitted logo is correct, as evidenced by the reliable and objective sources of [Coinmarketcap](#) and [Etherscan](#);

The image shows two screenshots of cryptocurrency websites. The top screenshot is from CoinMarketCap, displaying the KRYLL (KRL) token page. It shows the token's price in EUR as €0,048540 with a -6,90% change. It also lists prices in BTC and ETH. The bottom screenshot is from Etherscan, showing the token's overview and profile summary. The overview includes the price in USD (\$0.0544), market cap (\$2,687,603.99), total supply (49,417,348 KRL), holders (4,090 addresses), and transfers (10,930). The profile summary includes the contract address, decimals (18), and the official site (https://kryll.io/).

- **3° finally**, there is no other logo for the KRL token; the other existing logos are used expressly for social networks or for the mobile application; this is clearly specified by the presskit of the project which can be downloaded [here](#);

Consequently, the judgment of this case will be simple for jurors. They will only have to ask themselves one question: when several logos exist, does the Submitter have to submit the logo representing the token or another logo (the one used on social networks for example)?

If the question is simple, this case could set a precedent because the question to be decided is decisive and is found in many cases.

We believe that, when several logos exist, the logo to be submitted is the TOKEN logo and NOT THE PROJECT LOGO.

The reference to logos used on social networks is therefore not relevant because the logos used on social networks always represent the project and not the token issued by the project.

For example, in the case of the Trust token project, it would not be relevant to submit the project logo as the project has issued several tokens. Thus, the application should be accompanied by the logo of the token concerned and not the project logo.

TUSD Token logo




TGBP Token logo



Project logo



Telegram logo



Twitter logo



For the KRL token, the question is the same; the token logo does not match the project logo; **the submitted logo is the one representing the KRL token.**

The challenge, which is not supported by any evidence, must therefore be rejected and the listing of the token must be accepted.