EXHIBIT B

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY TERRY GENE BOLLEA, professionally known as HULK HOGAN, Plaintiff, No. 12-012447-CI-011 vs. HEATHER CLEM; GAWKER MEDIA, LLC, aka GAWKER MEDIA, et al., Defendants. HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAMELA CAMPBELL DATE: October 29, 2013 10:22 a.m. to 12:31 p.m. TIME: PLACE: Pinellas County Courthouse 545 First Avenue North St. Petersburg, Florida REPORTED BY: Susan C. Riesdorph, RPR, CRR Notary Public, State of Florida

Pages 1 - 107

case saying certain things in the complaint. He brought it originally, as you know, in federal court with much fanfare and a press conference and asked for a hundred dollars million dollars, which certainly got our attention. So we have tried to better understand his claims. And while his -- Mr. Harder sort of said, well, we've been asking for every document that he has. So far we've gotten a total of 17 documents in the first production, and we got -- other than things that we created or that were publicly available. And then we got one more document last Friday along with a whole bunch of articles about Gawker Media which were used as exhibits at the depositions of our people that happened at the end of September.

2.2

THE COURT: Those are the 600-some-odd number of responses?

MR. BERLIN: Right. So we have a stack of documents, but in terms of actual things that are not just pages from our website or articles about our people, it's very, very little.

Let me start, if I could, with the economic damages. And I think that this is -- you know, we're sort of in agreement about some of the legal principles that animate this and, that is that if

it's relevant to the issues in the case, it's discoverable. And, of course, we do have in place a protective order. So to the extent that there's the production of sensitive information, obviously it should be produced more confidential and we'll treat it as such.

THE COURT: This is the agreed protective order governing confidentiality that I signed --

MR. BERLIN: July 25th, I believe, Your Honor.

2.2

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BERLIN: And, in fact, realizing that -let me just speak a word about that. Realizing -before I get to the specific topics, realizing
that some of the discovery that we were asking for
which -- because the discovery had already been
served by July 25th -- and realizing that some of
the discovery that plaintiff was asking for
involved, for example, financial information about
Gawker, which we've produced, we went to them and
said, hey, we should have a protective order. We
negotiated the terms over the space of about 30
days. Mr. Cohen and his colleagues got in on it,
and then we presented it to you, to the Court.
And we think that it actually provides a fair bit

of background for how we should proceed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

Turning to the economic damages, the complaint that you have now before you talks about injury to the plaintiff's brand as a wrestler, as an actor, as a television personality. He -- and he echoed this -- Mr. Harder echoed this today. The plaintiff is entitled to seek, and hereby does seek, the market value of the use of his publicity rights. Right? So our task is to try and understand, okay, you say this injured you economically. How so? Right? So we asked some questions.

Now, one of the things that we've learned, for example, which we did not get in discovery was we asked for other lawsuits that he had been a party to, including, particularly as it relates to this, around the same time. One of the things we learned from our own investigation was that in January of this year, he sued a company that did some spine surgery on him and claims to have lost two years of professional opportunities. Well, he can't come into this court and say I lost professional opportunities and come into that court and say I lost professional opportunities and then say I'm not going to disclose that. I

mean, that's sort of fair game in this process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

In his divorce case, right, we don't want to go through all of the messy custody issues. That's not what this is about. But in his divorce case, he petitioned the court -- again, we found this out on our own by just getting the court record -- that he asked for modification of support claiming that his career was on the wane and that his earning potential was diminished. And that all happened before this tape was posted. Again, that's fair game if you were -- if you're claiming economic damages, then the way our adversarial system works is you put that up to scrutiny.

how has the brand been affected? You know, since investigation -- that he's opened up a store. He's opened up a restaurant. He's launched a hosting service for websites called Hostamania, which is based on his wrestling monicker Hulkmania and in which, by the way, he appears in a thong imitating an overtly sexual Miley Cyrus music video in which she appears nude and undertakes a

Since then, right, we say, well, you know, then we've learned -- again, from our own with his bare buttocks exposed in the ads

variety of sexually suggestive acts. I have to say I didn't know that -- I didn't get the joke on my own. I had to have my younger colleagues explain to me the Miley Cyrus video, but it was explained.

2.2

We also understand that he's in the process of renewing his agreement with either TNA or WWE, which are both wrestling companies. And so to the extent that somebody says, I was injured in my brand by this, we're entitled to say, like, okay, here's all the stuff that happened immediately after this video was posted and it seems like your business is going well.

Again, all of this -- I'm just giving you examples that we've been able to find on our own. We have nothing on this subject in any of the discovery. And, in fact, as Mr. Harder alluded, a number of celebrities -- and I'll come back to this in a little bit -- a number of celebrities don't actually lose money when a sex video is posted and sometimes they release it themselves because it actually enhances their career because it draws attention to it, for better or worse. I don't make a judgment about whether that is a good thing or a bad thing, but that is, in fact, true.

1 MR. HARDER: Fair game meaning what? 2 THE COURT: In cross-examination. 3 MR. HARDER: You mean fair game in terms of 4 medical records? 5 THE COURT: Medical, divorce records, any of 6 the other aspects of the things that Mr. Berlin 7 brought up would seem to me --MR. HARDER: Okay. 9 THE COURT: That's -- we're a ways off from 10 that, but --11 MR. HARDER: Okay. I mean, I just don't see 12 that because somebody is taped against their 13 knowledge and against their will and somebody 14 posts that to the Internet that now the plaintiff 15 has to open up their life. 16 THE COURT: You know, you should sit in any 17 day of the week that we're in here in jury trials. 18 I understand where you're coming from. 19 MR. HARDER: I don't see why anyone would 20 ever want to seek redress if now suddenly they 21 have to be violated a second time, a third time, 2.2 and a fourth, and a fifth time every time they're 23 deposed, every time they go on the stand, every 24 time they have to open up all their medical 25 entries and everything, especially to a company

that is in the business of posting things to the Internet where they come across something and they're like, oh, this is a juicy tidbit; let's throw that up on the website.

THE COURT: I totally understand what you're saying. But like, for example, Mr. Bollea's divorce proceeding, we have government in sunshine here. Unless the judge sealed certain parts of it, that whole file is open to public record.

MR. HARDER: And if they want to go look at the file, I'm not trying to stop them from looking at the file. What I'm trying to stop them from doing is having us make a photocopy of the file and everything else that goes along with it that wasn't part of the public file, because I don't see how a divorce proceeding is --

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's just move on because I think those are ultimately -- some of those are going to be issues on down the road.

But go ahead.

MR. HARDER: In terms of damages, Mr. Berlin talked a lot about -- it sounds like he thinks that now our damages theory is that Hulk Hogan's career was damaged because of the sex tape being posted and we are seeking damages because of the

1 harm to his career. That's not what we're 2 seeking. 3 THE COURT: But, see, they don't know. So 4 that's why --5 MR. HARDER: Well, I've told him. We had a 6 three-hour phone conversation and I told him that. 7 I said if he happens to have lost a contract or an 8 opportunity, then we'll produce that contract or 9 opportunity. I don't know of any. And I've asked 10 my client many times. And if Your Honor wants to 11 just say, okay, you have until X day to produce 12 any contracts that you claim were lost, that's 13 I'm happy to have a deadline, because I 14 don't think we're going to end up producing 15 anything because I don't think that he lost any 16 contracts as a result of what Gawker Media did. 17 We're not seeking damages to his career. 18 think Mr. Berlin said, well, sometimes a 19 celebrity's career goes up rather than down 20 because of a celebrity sex tape. Maybe that's the 21 case. It's not a point that's being made by us in 2.2 this case. We're not saying that his career went 23 down or his career went up because of this sex 24 tape. What we're saying is that there is a 25 tremendous amount of commercial value in a

celebrity sex tape. Some celebrities -- or some sex -- celebrity sex tapes make \$10 million, \$15 million, \$20 million from the tape itself because so many people go to a site and plunk down money and want to watch it.

2.2

2.4

What we're saying is, they got the value of five million plus people who were unique to Gawker Media, unique viewers, went there, and their -
their company was enhanced financially because of it and the value that they got is the value of a celebrity sex tape in which Hulk Hogan is the star. So we want the value rather than allowing them to have it. It has nothing to do with whether his career was harmed or not.

Mr. Berlin went for a while trying to -- it sounded like he was saying that Hulk Hogan has been inconsistent in his allegations in this case. The only thing -- and I will admit to this -- the only thing that was inconsistent is the 2006 versus 2008. When Hulk Hogan first said this happened six years ago, I think that my office took it literally rather than figuratively. I think when he said it happened six years ago, he was meaning it happened many years ago. And so when we initially prepared the papers, we made a

mistake and we said, okay, it's 2012, and then we go back six years, so that's 2006. And then in further talking to him about this, we got down the actual timeline based upon other things that were happening in his life, including his separation. He did live with the Clems for a short period of time, I think two weeks or two months or somewhere in between there. I never said that he didn't. But that was part of the timeline. So once we got him down on the timeline, it turns out it happened to be in 2008 rather than 2006. And I apologize, but that was an inadvertent error. That doesn't mean you open up the floodgates to discovery. means we goofed and we unfortunately had our client sign something that was under penalty of perjury that was off by two years. And I apologize for that. But, again, it doesn't lead to this opening of the floodgates.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

In terms of what Mr. Berlin was presenting to the Court -- and I can talk about the public statement. When Bubba Clem was sued, he went on the radio and he told things that weren't true. He said Hulk Hogan was in on this. That wasn't true. And it was, I suppose, the passion of the moment after having just been sued and his

reputation was being maligned. And because he's a radio personality, he didn't want people to think that he was running around taping people having sex in his bedroom without their knowledge. But the truth is exactly what Hulk Hogan has said. And that's why we brought this lawsuit. That's why we're fighting it so hard. That's why there is so much money being spent. If this was something that Hulk didn't care about -- and Mr. Berlin implied that, that Hulk let this tape get released -- why would we be doing all this? I mean, that doesn't make any sense at all.

And Bubba Clem made an apology. He went public with his statement. He put it in writing and he signed it and he read it on the air. And he said, what I said before was untrue. These are the true facts. Hulk Hogan had nothing to do with this.

In terms of discovery, though, we're happy to give them everything that we have that's not privileged that pertains to this encounter. And we've done it. In terms of -- there's not a whole lot. They make it sound like, oh, there's all these documents and we haven't gotten any of them.

The document that Mr. Berlin handed to the

2.2

the people that prepare his taxes, any of those, the plaintiff's objection is sustained.

Let me back up. As far as the medical records, that includes the names of all of Mr. Bollea's physicians.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The divorce proceeding, information regarding the divorce proceeding, as far as Mr. Bollea, the plaintiff's objections are sustained.

As it pertains to Mr. Bollea, or for that matter, Ms. Clem's sex life, the questions that the Court would determine to be relevant are only as it relates to the sexual relations between Mr. Bollea and Ms. Clem for the time frame 2002 to the present, which was the time frame related I believe in the request, 2002 to the present, but the other additional -- for example, interrogatory No. 4, interrogatory No. 5, No. 6, No. 7, No. 8, No. 9, the objections by the plaintiff are being sustained. So questions pertaining to like, for example, interrogatory No. 10, identify any and all times you discussed having sexual relations with Heather Clem and her husband, Todd Alan Clem, during the relevant time period stating for each time the date, approximate time, location, and substantive discussion, the objections would be

overruled. Plaintiff's objections would be overruled. So as it pertains to the three -- and I guess we really need to include Mr. Clem in that aspect -- those three parties are fair game for questions as it pertains to each other.

Is that pretty clear? I think that pretty much gives guidance as to all the different interrogatories globally as to the sex life aspect of it.

Do you think so, Mr. Berlin?

2.2

MR. BERLIN: If I may ask just a clarifying question. In the questioning you had an exchange with Mr. Harder about, if we're going to limit proof on emotional distress and we're going to limit proof on economic damages, which I understand your ruling to do, then there would be limits on proof at trial. I wanted to -- in an effort not to run afoul of the Court's ruling and to understand how we should prepare our case, I want to understand what the appropriate -- you know, what that would look like at trial so that we can prepare and get the information we need, but not overstep the bounds of the Court's ruling.

THE COURT: I think some of that is going to have to come up later on and maybe even more

specific, because you mentioned a number of things today that I think would be fair game for you to know, especially for purposes of trial. and I guess maybe, Mr. Harder, you made the offer to give you a deadline for any contracts or events. It seems as though today in your oral presentation, you have significantly eliminated a number of theories of damages. So with that being said, that then sort of eliminates a lot of the areas of inquiry on the -- for the defense. I'm thinking that maybe comes about later on in a motion for limine. They don't give you any of the information, so therefore, they're not allowed to now bring it up during trial. But, on the other hand, if Mr. Bollea is saying, I was under severe stress because of this, and, Mr. Berlin, you find out, well, yeah, he was under stress because he was also going through a divorce and some of these other areas, I think I would rather see those more accurately framed in a motion that I could specifically rule on prior to a trial.

Does that make sense?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

MR. BERLIN: I think it makes a lot of sense,
Your Honor. And perhaps it's implicit in the
Court's ruling, but I want to clarify this as

1 There is an interrogatory -- I think 2 No. 12, but I may be mis-recalling that -- that 3 asked for the plaintiff to set forth his theories 4 We have no sort of meaningful answer of damages. 5 to that. It would seem to me that the first step 6 in going down the road that Your Honor just 7 outlined would be to do that. I think that's a good idea. THE COURT: 9 MR. BERLIN: Then we can bring the motion 10 that you just described so that we're all on the 11 same page and we won't have these problems. 12 THE COURT: I think you're right. 13 interrogatory No. 12, it says, identify any and 14 all damages purportedly suffered by you as a 15 result of alleged actions by the Gawker defendant 16 and then explain with particularity the basis for 17 your calculation of such alleged damages. 18 thinking that --19 MR. HARDER: We gave them a supplemental 20 response to that. 21

THE COURT: You did?

2.2

23

24

25

I don't believe there's any MR. BERLIN: supplemental response to that, Your Honor. We got a supplemental response to document requests. have no supplemental response to that.

1 MR. HARDER: I may be mistaken. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Harder will look at it. 3 he can give that to you let's say prior to 4 November 11th or whenever the deposition is 5 scheduled, that would be helpful. Is his 6 scheduled on the 11th? 7 MR. BERLIN: I believe he's the 12th, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Okay. So perhaps you could give 10 that response by the 8th, which is the Friday 11 before. 12 I will. MR. HARDER: 13 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else that I can 14 give clarification on? 15 MR. COHEN: Yes, Your Honor. The deposition 16 of Mr. Clem, is it my understanding that he's not 17 going to show up on the 11th or is he --18 MR. BERLIN: His lawyer is saying he's not 19 available, but we have for two months asked for a 20 different day and said, look, we'll release you on 21 that day if you give us a different day. 2.2 haven't. I would ask the Court to authorize us to 23 proceed because we have counsel coming in from all 24 over the country. 25 THE COURT: It seems to me like it's