GEORGE FROST SBN 178528)							
t							
-647-8863							
ncast.net							
ff Bitstamp Ltd.							
UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT						
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
gn company,	Case No. 3:15-cv-1503						
ff,	COMPLAINT FOR INTERPLEADER						
	UNDER FRCP RULE 22						
a California Corporation.							
a California Corporation, N, an individual, individual, JED							
dual, and DOES 1							
lants.							

1

Complaint for Interpleader

Plaintiff Bitstamp Ltd. ("Bitstamp"), for its Complaint for Interpleader Under Rule 22 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("Complaint"), states and alleges as follows:

PARTIES.

- 1. Bitstamp is a UK company with its registered place of business at 5 New Street Square, London EC4A 3TW, United Kingdom. Bitstamp operates a worldwide digital currency exchange and is a gateway on the Ripple protocol. With respect to the dispute at issue, Bitstamp is a disinterested stakeholder and seeks the Court's assistance in resolving ownership rights of rival claimaints to the same assets.
- 2. Defendant Ripple Labs Inc. ("Ripple Labs"), is a Delaware corporation maintaining its principal place of business at 300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94104.
- 3. On information and belief, Defendant Jed McCaleb ("McCaleb") is a co-founder, Board member and Developer of Stellar Development Foundation ("Stellar"), a virtual currency company based in San Francisco, California. On information and belief, McCaleb is a resident of San Francisco, California.
- 4. On information and belief, Jacob Stephenson ("Stephenson") is a resident of Arkansas, and is McCaleb's cousin.
- 5. On information and belief, Nancy Harris ("Harris") is a resident of Arkansas and is Stephenson's mother and McCaleb's aunt.
- 6. On information and belief, there are other unknown or potential defendants that have not yet asserted claims or are unknown. Does 1-10 are the fictitious names of those defendants. When such defendants are ascertained, Bitstamp will amend this Complaint by inserting true names in place of fictitious names in accordance with Rule 10 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE.

7. The United States District Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 22 and 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because (a) the property, amount of money, or obligation to pay money involved is in excess of \$75,000 and (b) Plaintiff, a foreign entity, is of diverse citizenship from each and every Defendant/claimant.

- 8. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Ripple Labs and McCaleb are residents of the Northern District of California and because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim set forth herein occurred in this district.
- 9. The United States District Court for the Northern District of California has or will have personal jurisdiction over all claimants/Defendants because each claimant/Defendant has sufficient minimum contact with this district.

FACTS.

- 10. Ripple Labs develops open source software that implements and interacts with the Ripple "protocol", a decentralized ledger payment standard. Ripple Labs is also a holder of XRP, which is the digital currency native to the Ripple protocol. XRP is a math-based currency used only within the Ripple protocol.
- 11. The servers that run the Ripple protocol collectively maintain an official ledger, which tracks balances in every Ripple account, and every transaction that utilizes the Ripple protocol.
- 12. Among its other business functions, Bitstamp operates as a gateway for XRP, permitting the exchange of XRP for other digital currency and fiat currency, including U.S. dollars.
- 13. On or about March 26, 2015, Bitstamp received a letter from Ripple Labs claiming that it was entitled to approximately \$75,000 in Bitstamp's possession, transferred therein as a result of the sale of XRP, and demanding that Bitstamp release that \$75,000 to Ripple Labs, upon the receipt of which Ripple Labs would return the corresponding amount of XRP to the account it originated from. In this letter, Ripple Labs represented that, on August 13, 2014, Ripple Labs and McCaleb (and others) entered into a contract (the "Contract") under which McCaleb agreed to abide by certain limitations regarding the sale of XRP within in his ownership and control, and pursuant to that contract, McCaleb agreed to limit sales, and that of his family members, to \$10,000 XRP per week, and that this agreement had been breached by the sale of XRP by Ripple account number r3Q3B6A2giHDMef83AztzBStBm1JBmxUKX ("r3Q").

- 14. On or about March 30, 2015, Bitstamp received a second letter from Ripple Labs claiming that it was entitled to approximately \$963,000 of additional funds in Bitstamp's possession due to the breach of the Contract, and demanding that Bitstamp release a total of \$1,038,172 to Ripple Labs, upon the receipt of which Ripple Labs would return the XRP to the account it originated from.
- 15. The \$1,038,172 demanded by Ripple Labs can be traced back to a large XRP sale made by Ripple account number r3Q3B6A2giHDMef83AztzBStBm1JBmxUKX ("r3Q"). On information and belief, r3Q is controlled by Stephenson and McCaleb.
- 16. On information and belief, or around March 16, 2015, Stellar initiated an auction of its native currency, STR, in order to cover its operating expenses. On information and belief, Stellar's unaudited quarterly financials show that its expenses were in the range of \$700,000, about half of which was for payroll. Thus, on information and belief, Stellar placed 650 million STR into an account on the Coinex gateway from which the auction would draw ("Auction STR"). On information and belief, as of March 19, 2015 -- three days into the auction -- Stellar was still left holding more than *640 million Auction STR* on the Coinex gateway. On information and belief, the listed price for Auction STR was \$0.0031 US dollars per STR. As such, on information and belief, a few days into its auction Stellar had only raised an estimated \$25,000.
- 17. On or around January 6, 2015, Ripple account number rUf6pynZ8ucVj1jC9bKExQ7mb9sQFooTPK ("rUf6") with Ripple name ~aluminumcans, transferred 10 million XRP to r3Q. On or around March 20, 2015, rUf6 transferred an additional 89,999,900 XRP to r3Q. On information and belief, rUf6 is controlled by Harris, Stephenson and McCaleb.
- 18. On or around March 20, 2015, r3Q offered to sell 98,846,600 XRP on the Bitstamp USD order book, which included the 89,999,900 XRP it received from rUf6 on or around that date and an additional 8,846,700 XRP of the 10 million XRP that r3Q had previously received from rUf6 on or around January 6, 2015. On information and belief, this offer was made at McCaleb's direction and for McCaleb's and Stellar's benefit, with the intent to use the funds to purchase STR from the Auction STR.

- 19. On information and belief, immediately after the offer to sell was placed by r3Q, the seller entered into numerous transactions to sell small amounts of that XRP. On information and belief, on or around March 20, 2015, Ripple Labs, through its agent, purchased all of the remaining XRP offered by r3Q, which consisted of 96,342,361.6 XRP, for \$1,038,172.
- 20. In the two letter communications to Bitstamp, Ripple Labs represents that it purchased this XRP in order to avoid and mitigate irreparable harm and damages that would have been caused to Ripple Labs by the XRP sale conducted by McCaleb, Stephenson and Harris. Ripple Labs further represents that the XRP sale was done in breach of McCaleb's Contract with Ripple Labs.
- 21. Ripple Labs' agent sent the \$1,038,172 in purchase funds to r3Q on the Bitstamp gateway. Ripple Labs is demanding the purchase funds back, upon which it has agreed it will return the purchased XRP to rUf6.
- 22. There is thus now an issue in controversy over who is entitled to possess that \$1,038,172 (the "Disputed Funds").
- 23. On information and belief, between March 20, 2015 and through present date, r3Q has been and continues to be attempting to "bridge out" the Disputed Funds to remove them from the Ripple Network in order to purchase additional STR. The Disputed Funds are being held in the following Ripple accounts: (1) r3Q, (2) rvYAfWj5gh67oV6fW32ZzP3Aw4Eubs59B ("rvYA"), and (3) rPQB4rgmwoaCjdX4BeoWikeshWL3fLMLD7 ("rPQ").
- 24. On March 31st, Bitstamp acted to "freeze" the accounts on the Ripple Network containing the Disputed Funds due to the pending ownership controversy, regulatory/AML concerns and the size and circumstances of the transfers.
 - 25. Bitstamp is facing conflicting ownership claims from the Defendants.
- 26. Ripple Labs made a claim to the Disputed Funds that r3Q is attempting to remove from the Ripple Network and asked Bitstamp to transfer the Disputed Funds to Ripple Labs' Ripple account in exchange for Ripple Labs transferring the XRP back to rUf6.
 - 27. During the relevant time period, Stephenson has made a claim to the Disputed Funds.

- 28. On information and belief, McCaleb, who has control of r3Q according to Ripple Labs, may make a claim to the Disputed Funds pursuant to this filing.
- 29. On information and belief, Harris, who purports to own and control rUf6, may also make a claim to the Disputed Funds.
- 30. On information and belief, other unknown individuals who may assert ownership or other rights over Ripple accounts rvYA and/or rPQ, or who may assert ownership or other rights over Stellar Accounts gBhrQHtoP3ALV1AnscvfDH7f8yEgozaXd6 and/or g3Ezpa9GidCB7RD963Y5k3WFLz39w7d63Q may make claims to the Disputed Funds.
- 31. As for Bitstamp itself, we make no claim to the Disputed Funds except as to relief for costs and attorneys' fees as set forth in this Complaint.

INTERPLEADER PROPER TO DISPUTED CLAIMS.

- 32. With respect to the Disputed Funds, Bitstamp is a disinterested stakeholder.
- 33. Bitstamp does not know to which of said Defendants is entitled to the Disputed Funds.
- 34. Bitstamp has a real and reasonable fear of liability or vexatious, conflicting claims directed against the Disputed Funds and is not in the position to safely determine which party's claim to the Disputed Funds is meritorious without great hazard and possible multiple liability.
- 35. Under the provisions of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 22, Bitstamp is entitled to join all persons asserting claims against the Disputed Funds in a single proceeding so that Bitstamp may avoid duplicative litigation and the possibility of multiple or inconsistent liability on the conflicting and adverse claims of Defendants.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF.

WHEREFORE, Bitstamp prays for the following judgment:

- 36. That Bitstamp be allowed to continue to freeze the Disputed Funds until otherwise directed by the Court;
- 37. Defendants be required to interplead and assert in this proceeding and settle between themselves any and all claims which each or any of them have to the Disputed Funds and that Bitstamp be discharged from all liability relating to such benefits except to the party or parties whom

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12) cand rev (1/15/13) Case 3:15-cv-01503-WHO Document 1 VEIR 04/01/15 Page 1 of 2

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil do	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO	RM.)				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				DEFENDANTS				
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place on "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CI	<u> </u> TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	AL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintifj	
□ 1 U.S. Government	☐ 3 Federal Question	,,		(For Diversity Cases Only		,	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government i	Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State	01 01	Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh.)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 2 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 3	Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		orts	F.	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	D + 3	NKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury	Y 🗖 62	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	☐ 422 Appe ☐ 423 With 28 U	eal 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157 RTY RIGHTS	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation	
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability		LABOR	□ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY		□ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
 ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise 	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 555 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice	PERSONAL PROPER □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	□ 72 □ 74 □ 75	0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation		k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) O Title XVI	□ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION		1 Employee Retirement	FEDER.	AL TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
 □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property 	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty		Income Security Act IMMIGRATION	or D 871 IRS- 26 U	s (U.S. Plaintiff refendant) —Third Party JSC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition Conditions of Confinement		2 Naturalization Applicati 5 Other Immigration Actions	on			
		Remanded from Appellate Court	□ 4 Rein Reop		her District	☐ 6 Multidistr. Litigation	ict	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO		atute under which you a	re filing (I	Oo not cite jurisdictional s	tatutes unless di	versity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$		CHECK YES only URY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER		
DATE	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD							
KZ0'F KXKLKQP CN'CUUN PO GP'	V'*EkskriN0F05/4+							
(Place an "X" in One Box Only)	() SAN FRANCISCO/OA	KLAND	() SAN JOSE ()	EUREKA			

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included nere. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.