# KLEROS' TOKEN LISTING COURT

CHALLENGE – REJOINDER

## MONEYTOKEN (IMT) Token

2 June 2019

*TL;DR: The Submitter's arguments are inaccurate; the submitted logo does not comply with the requirements of the Curated List; its submission should be rejected.*

## 1.    DISPUTE STATEMENT

A request for a listing of the MoneyToken token has been submitted.

On 30 May 2019, we contested this submission on the grounds that the token logo was wrong.

On 31 May 2019, the Submitter pointed out that the logo submitted was the right logo because it was the one used by Etherscan and Coinmarket cap and matched the token logo, the project logo being different.

On 1 June 2019, the Submitter contested, arguing that the logo to be published did not necessarily have to be the most commonly used; that the logo was used on the site but the site is no longer online; that the logo is used by an exchange.

## 2.    APPLICABLE RULE

The Submitter argues that "*There is NO rule in the current TCR policy that state that the uploaded logo must be the widely used one*".

As in any normative system, a rule must be interpreted in the light of the intention of its authors and the objective pursued.

However, the Token Curated List Policies requires the submission of a logo and provides, with respect to the name, that "*The name should be the most commonly used name to refer to the asset. It does not necessarily need to be the official name given by project creators nor the one in the token contract*".

**The purpose of this rule, which has been mentioned several times by its authors, is to arrive at a list making it possible to identify tokens <u>in the most consensual way possible (name and logo).</u>**

It is therefore necessary to refer to **objective elements** to determine the most consensual logo:

-    when a logo is officially and clearly designated by project members as the token logo, this element is sufficiently objective to be considered as a consensus.

-    **however, when this is not the case, reference should be made to the most commonly used logo on an objective basis.**


## 3.    APPLICATION TO THE CASE

Thus, the Submitter is right when he considers that an official logo should prevail over the most commonly used logo (cf. MKR, DGD).

**But in this case, <u>the submitted logo is never used in an official way</u>. The Submitter refers to an article that used the submitted logo. But there are dozens of articles using a different logo. It is therefore <u>completely misleading to consider that this article alone makes it possible to confer official value on the disputed logo</u>.**

Jurors are invited to check themselves on the project blog.

**However, the vast majority of sources referring to IMT token use a different logo.**

**Accepting the submitted logo would create confusion** in the minds of users and establish a logo as official on the basis of an error made by the Submitter, who **merely copied the incorrect information contained on Etherscan.**

CHALLENGE – REJOINDER – MONEYTOKEN Token – 2 June 2019

It doesn't matter that the logo

- is the one used by Etherscan; many examples show that Etherscan is not a reliable source for determining an official logo (which results only from the project's will) or for determining the most commonly used logo:

    - LND on T2CR vs on Etherscan;

    - DXT on T2CR vs on Etherscan;

    - BNT on T2CR vs on Etherscan;

    - AGRI on T2CR vs on Etherscan;

    - EDO on T2CR vs on Etherscan, etc.

- has been recognized as part of the project by the team members since it has not been designated as the official logo.


**We have demonstrated that <u>the logo has never been designated as the official logo</u> of either the token or the project.**

**We also brought <u>more than 30 sources using a different logo</u> while the Submitter brought about 5.**


**For all these reasons, the listing request cannot be favourably received.**

**CONSEQUENTLY, JURORS ARE INVITED TO REJECT THE SUBMISSION.**


\*
\* \*