EXHIBIT 7

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

```
1
      APPEARANCES:
2
         CHARLES J. HARDER, ESQUIRE
         Harder Mirell & Abrams, LLP
 3
         1801 Avenue of the Stars
         Suite 1120
 4
         Los Angeles, California 90067
              - and -
 5
         KENNETH G. TURKEL, ESQUIRE
         Bajo Cuva Cohen & Turkel, P.A.
 6
         100 North Tampa Street
         Suite 1900
 7
         Tampa, Florida 33602
              Attorneys for Plaintiff
8
9
         SETH D. BERLIN, ESQUIRE
         ALIA L. SMITH, ESQUIRE
10
         Levine Sullivan Koch & Schulz, LLP
         1899 L Street, N.W.
11
         Suite 200
         Washington, D.C. 20036
12
              - and -
         GREGG D. THOMAS, ESQUIRE
13
         Thomas & Locicero, PL
         601 South Boulevard
14
         Tampa, Florida 33606
              Attorneys for Defendant Gawker Media, LLC
15
16
         BARRY A. COHEN, ESQUIRE
         Barry A. Cohen Law Group
17
         201 East Kennedy Boulevard
         Suite 1000
18
         Tampa, Florida 33602
              Attorney for Defendant Heather Clem
19
20
21
22
                         INDEX
23
      PROCEEDINGS
                                                    Page
                                                           3
24
      REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
                                                    Page 107
2.5
```

PROCEEDINGS

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 COURT: We're here on Case No. 12-012447,

Terry Bollea versus Gawker Media and others.

Today we are here for a number of motions.

I saw a bunch of correspondence going back and forth about the notebook. I'm going to tell you, it was just, I have to say, irritating to read some of the correspondence.

Let me make it really clear for everybody. I'm sure I've said this before. You all are required to file things through the ePortal. can't see it yet, which is a technical difficulty So I rely on -- I have to rely on the attorneys to send me copies of motions ahead of So if somebody wants to put together a notebook, I greatly appreciate it. If somebody just wants to send me copies individually, since I'm paying for the toner cartridges since the government doesn't give us enough money for the toner cartridges, I'm not printing out all your long volumes of stuff. So if somebody would please send me copies of them -- a notebook is really good and helpful. It's just helpful. just makes our proceedings much more efficient. think hopefully you all have been with me enough

complaint. So --

1.5

2.2

MR. HARDER: Right.

THE COURT: -- here we are. So we're a year into the complaint almost. And at what point in time do you say, well, this is what we're -- at some point in time, we'll let you know. No. The time to let them know is now. We're doing the discovery now.

MR. HARDER: I understand, Your Honor. Our damages are twofold in terms of the economic damages. One is Gawker Media's unjust enrichment. Gawker Media received upwards of five million unique viewers because of this sex tape. They posted it. Millions and millions of people went to their websites, and they gained a large number of new viewers. And ad revenues were generated because of that, both short-term ad revenues and long-term ad revenues because now they have potentially five million new people who come to their websites. Perhaps they never knew about Gawker and or their other websites and now they do and now they frequent those websites.

So what we're undertaking is an analysis -- and our motion to compel is seeking this information -- an analysis of where Gawker was

and eliminate from the picture, you know, publishing it online.

2.2

Unless there are any questions about all of the various things that we've talked about, I'll sit down. Because some of that was related to our affirmative motion, I probably would like to just reserve a brief amount for rebuttal.

THE COURT: Okay. We're stopping at noon.

So let me throw this out, because I still want to allow him an opportunity, Mr. Harder. And I understand part of the motion to compel. In going through a lot of this yesterday, it seems to me that there are going to be -- Mr. Harder thinks it's objectionable, you think it's not objectionable as -- when you get into the actual deposition itself.

It seems to me that the appointment of a special magistrate would be -- for discovery purposes would be an efficient tool so that there was somebody right there at the -- during these depositions to make calls. I was trying to think of who would that person be. I think this is a unique case that would require a unique person.

So the person I was thinking about -- and I -- you're Mr. Berlin, right?

There is an interrogatory -- I think No. 12, but I may be mis-recalling that -- that asked for the plaintiff to set forth his theories We have no sort of meaningful answer of damages. to that. It would seem to me that the first step in going down the road that Your Honor just outlined would be to do that.

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

I think that's a good idea. THE COURT:

MR. BERLIN: Then we can bring the motion that you just described so that we're all on the same page and we won't have these problems.

THE COURT: I think you're right. interrogatory No. 12, it says, identify any and all damages purportedly suffered by you as a result of alleged actions by the Gawker defendant and then explain with particularity the basis for your calculation of such alleged damages. thinking that --

MR. HARDER: We gave them a supplemental response to that.

> THE COURT: You did?

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. If
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,
8	Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Okay. So perhaps you could give
10	that response by the 8th, which is the Friday
11	before.
12	MR. HARDER: I will.
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. We
22	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

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA :
4	COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH :
5	
6	
7	I, Susan C. Riesdorph, RPR, CRR certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.
9	I further certify that I am not a relative,
10	employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
11	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the outcome of the foregoing
12	action.
13	Dated this 31st day of October, 2013, IN THE CITY OF TAMPA, COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH, STATE OF FLORIDA.
14	
15	
16	
17	Susan C. Riesdorph, RPR, CRR, CLSP
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	