

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA

TERRY GENE BOLLEA professionally
known as HULK HOGAN,

Plaintiff,

Case No.: 12012447-CI-011

vs.

HEATHER CLEM; GAWKER MEDIA,
LLC aka GAWKER MEDIA; et al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

**DEFENDANT NICK DENTON'S RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

Pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.350, Defendant Nick Denton ("Denton") hereby provides this response to Plaintiff's First Request for the Production of Documents dated June 16, 2014.

REQUESTS AND RESPONSES

REQUEST NO. 1: All DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS that constitute, REFER TO or RELATE TO any and all of YOUR policies, notices and agreements, for the period January 1, 2011, through the present, RELATING TO the protection of YOUR professional privacy or confidentiality, including without limitation, nondisclosure agreements, confidentiality agreements, confidentiality clauses within agreements, and notifications to PERSONS requesting that they respect YOUR privacy or confidentiality generally, or take specific steps to respect YOUR personal privacy or confidentiality.

RESPONSE: Denton objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, including without limitation because any steps taken by Denton to protect the confidentiality of

his business or professional affairs is not relevant to the publication of content relating to a matter of public concern by a news organization.

Denton further objects to this Request to the extent that the definition of “YOU” and “YOUR” encompasses persons other than Denton as the responding party. Denton’s responses are limited to documents in his possession, custody and control.

Denton further objects to this Request on the grounds that, by seeking “all documents” that relate to this topic, it (a) seeks information that may be protected by the attorney-client privilege or under the work product doctrine,¹ and (b) is overbroad and unreasonably burdensome.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Denton states that: (1) defendant Gawker Media, LLC (“Gawker”) has already produced confidentiality agreements entered into in connection with Denton’s business or professional dealings, in his capacity as president of Gawker, in response to plaintiff’s Document Request No. 126 to Gawker (*see* Gawker 23398_C to Gawker 23409_C), and Denton respectfully refers plaintiff to those previously-produced documents; and, (2) to the best of his knowledge, Denton has no documents relating to requests that others “respect” his “privacy or confidentiality generally” or that others “take specific steps to respect [his] personal privacy or confidentiality.”

REQUEST NO. 2: All DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS that constitute, REFER TO or RELATE TO any and all of YOUR policies, notices and agreements, for the period January 1, 2011, through the present, RELATING TO the protection of YOUR personal

¹ Consistent with past practice between the parties, Denton is not providing a privilege log in connection with these responses because any privileged communications that would otherwise be responsive to these Requests occurred well after the commencement of the Lawsuit, as that term is defined in Plaintiff’s First Request for Production of Documents to Gawker Media, LLC, and relate to the preparation of Denton’s responses to plaintiff’s discovery requests.

privacy or confidentiality, including without limitation, the privacy of YOUR wedding in or about May 2014, the details of any honeymoon YOU planned to take or took thereafter, YOUR relationship with Derrence Washington, YOUR relationships with YOUR family and friends, and any other aspect of YOUR personal or private life.

RESPONSE: Denton objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Denton further objects to this Request to the extent that the definition of “YOU” and “YOUR” encompasses persons other than Denton as the responding party. Denton’s responses are limited to documents in his possession, custody and control.

Denton further objects to this Request on the grounds that, by seeking “all documents” that relate to this topic, it seeks information that may be protected by the attorney-client privilege or under the work product doctrine.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, Denton states that to the best of his knowledge, he has no documents responsive to this Request in his possession, custody or control.

REQUEST NO. 3: All DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS that constitute, REFER TO or RELATE TO any and all efforts that YOU undertook to minimize the taking and/or publication of photographs or video of YOUR wedding by guests or other PERSONS, not including YOU, Derrence Washington, or any photographer or videographer hired by YOU or Derrence Washington.

RESPONSE: Denton objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Denton further objects to this Request to the extent that the definition of “YOU” and “YOUR” encompasses persons other than Denton as the responding party. Denton’s responses are limited to documents in his possession, custody and control.

Denton further objects to this Request on the grounds that, by seeking “all documents and communications” that “refer” or “relate” to this topic, it seeks information that may be protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving this objection, Denton will produce all non-privileged responsive documents in his possession, custody and control; specifically, he will produce the information sheet that he and Derrence Washington sent to guests of his wedding, which included, among other things that are not responsive to this Request, information about guests’ mobile phone use.

REQUEST NO. 4: All DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS that constitute, REFER TO or RELATE TO any and all efforts that YOU undertook to minimize the number of PERSONS having access to the details of YOUR honeymoon (including the date, location, hotel, dinner reservations, or any other detail).

RESPONSE: Denton objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Denton further objects to this Request to the extent that the definition of “YOU” and “YOUR” encompasses persons other than Denton as the responding party. Denton’s responses are limited to documents in his possession, custody and control.

Denton further objects to this Request on the grounds that, by seeking “all documents and communications” that “refer” or “relate” to this topic, it seeks information that may be protected by the attorney-client privilege or under the work product doctrine.

Subject to and without waiving this objection, Denton states that, to the best of his knowledge, he has no documents responsive to this Request in his possession, custody or control.

Dated: July 28, 2014

THOMAS & LOCICERO PL

By: /s/ Gregg D. Thomas

Gregg D. Thomas

Florida Bar No.: 223913

Rachel E. Fugate

Florida Bar No.: 0144029

601 South Boulevard

P.O. Box 2602 (33601)

Tampa, FL 33606

Telephone: (813) 984-3060

Facsimile: (813) 984-3070

gthomas@tlolawfirm.com

rfugate@tlolawfirm.com

Seth D. Berlin

Pro Hac Vice Number: 103440

Michael Berry

Pro Hac Vice Number: 108191

Alia L. Smith

Pro Hac Vice Number: 104249

Paul J. Safier

Pro Hac Vice Number: 103437

Julie B. Ehrlich

Pro Hac Vice Number: 108190

LEVINE SULLIVAN KOCH & SCHULZ, LLP

1899 L Street, NW, Suite 200

Washington, DC 20036

Telephone: (202) 508-1122

Facsimile: (202) 861-9888

sberlin@lskslaw.com

mberry@lskslaw.com

asmith@lskslaw.com

psafier@lskslaw.com

jehrich@lskslaw.com

Counsel for Defendant Nick Denton

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 28th day of July 2014, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be served via the Florida Courts' E-Filing Portal upon the following counsel of record:

Kenneth G. Turkel, Esq.
kturkel@BajoCuva.com
Christina K. Ramirez, Esq.
cramirez@BajoCuva.com
Bajo Cuva Cohen & Turkel, P.A.
100 N. Tampa Street, Suite 1900
Tampa, FL 33602
Tel: (813) 443-2199
Fax: (813) 443-2193

David Houston, Esq.
dhouston@houstonatlaw.com
Law Office of David Houston
432 Court Street
Reno, NV 89501
Tel: (775) 786-4188

Charles J. Harder, Esq.
charder@HMAfirm.com
Douglas E. Mirell, Esq.
dmirell@HMAfirm.com
Harder Mirell & Abrams LLP
1925 Century Park East, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (424) 203-1600
Fax: (424) 203-1601

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Barry A. Cohen, Esq.
bcohen@tampalawfirm.com
Michael W. Gaines, Esq.
mgaines@tampalawfirm.com
Barry A. Cohen Law Group
201 East Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 1000
Tampa, FL 33602
Tel: (813) 225-1655
Fax: (813) 225-1921

Attorneys for Defendant Heather Clem

/s/ Gregg D. Thomas
Attorney