EXHIBIT 1

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

TERRY GENE BOLLEA, professionally known as HULK HOGAN,

Plaintiff, Case No.

12-012447-CI-011

VS.

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

Defendants.

TELEPHONIC HEARING BEFORE
THE HONORABLE JAMES CASE,
without confidential sessions

DATE: February 24, 2014

TIME: 1:32 p.m. to 3:27 p.m.

PLACE: Riesdorph Reporting Group

601 Cleveland Street

Suite 600

Clearwater, Florida

REPORTED BY: Aaron T. Perkins, RPR

Notary Public, State of

Florida at Large

Pages 1 to 89

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
2
3
       CHARLES J. HARDER, ESQUIRE
       Harder Mirell & Abrams, LLP
4
       1925 Century Park East
       Suite 800
5
       Los Angeles, California 90067
            - and -
6
       KENNETH G. TURKEL, ESQUIRE
       Bajo Cuva Cohen & Turkel, P.A.
       100 North Tampa Street
7
       Suite 1900
8
       Tampa, Florida 33602
9
            Attorneys for Plaintiff
10
11
       SETH D. BERLIN, ESQUIRE
12
       ALIA L. SMITH, ESQUIRE
       Levine Sullivan Koch & Schulz, LLP
13
       1899 L Street, N.W.
       Suite 200
14
       Washington, D.C. 20036
            - and -
15
       RACHEL E. FUGATE, ESQUIRE
       Thomas & Locicero, PL
16
       601 South Boulevard
       Tampa, Florida 33606
17
            Attorneys for Defendant Gawker Media, LLC
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

TNDFV		
	PAGE 4	
CONFIDENTIAL SESSION REMOVED	11	
CONFIDENTIAL SESSION REMOVED	17	
CONFIDENTIAL SESSION REMOVED	3 9	
CONTIDENTIAL SESSION REPOVED	3,9	
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	89	
	CONFIDENTIAL SESSION REMOVED CONFIDENTIAL SESSION REMOVED	PAGE PROCEEDINGS CONFIDENTIAL SESSION REMOVED 11 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION REMOVED 17 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION REMOVED 39

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Judge Case here, and I think 3 we've got everybody we need. 4 MR. BERLIN: Is Rachel on as well? 5 THE COURT: Yes. 6 MS. FUGATE: Yes, I am, Seth. 7 MR. BERLIN: Your Honor, I apologize 8 for being just a minute late. I actually tried to 9 dial in once before, and I had a technical glitch 10 and got a fast busy, so --11 THE COURT: No problem. 12 Charles, are you expecting anybody else on 13 your side? 14 MR. HARDER: No, I am not. 15 THE COURT: We've got Rachel. Anybody else? 16 We are not expecting anybody on MR. BERLIN: 17 our side, Your Honor, for the Gawker defendants. 18 And it is my understanding that because -- I don't 19 know this, but I'm surmising, because we have 20 tried to ascertain this but haven't heard anything 21 back -- that no one for Heather Clem are planning 22 on attending. They were served with the notice 23 and the papers. 24 THE COURT: All right. This is Judge Case, 25 and we're here on a couple of the defendants'

motions, and we'll start off with motion No. 1, if you want to, Seth.

MR. BERLIN: Very well, Your Honor. I'm happy to.

This is the first two of the served motions, which is -- it's titled our Expedited Motion to Compel Plaintiff's Compliance with the October 29th, 2013, Discovery Rulings and for Sanctions.

I think the court reporter got this, but I'm Seth Berlin speaking on behalf of the Gawker defendants.

Your Honor, on this motion I think what our position is, is largely stated on paper, so I will try just to hit the highlights, if I can.

But there is a little bit of a back story, which I just wanted to put the highlights in, if I may.

After serving discovery requests in June of last year and receiving responses in August after a 30-day extension, we filed a motion to compel supplemental discovery responses, and we filed that in early September.

The parties briefed that motion, and they also briefed a companion motion that was filed by plaintiff seeking a protective order. Then the

Court held a hearing and heard argument for more than two hours on October 29th, 2013. At the conclusion of the hearing Judge Campbell ruled, and as is relevant here, that -- and I'm reading her ruling here -- "As it pertains to Mr. Bollea or, for that matter, Ms. Clem's sex life, the questions that the Court will determine to be relevant are only as it relates to the sexual relations of Mr. Bollea and Ms. Clem for the time frame 2002 to the present."

1.5

Judge Campbell then gave some examples of things that would and would not be permitted, adhering to that line that she had laid out. And then she reiterated -- again, I'm quoting -- "So as it to pertains to the three -- 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. I think that pretty much gives guidance as to all the different interrogatories globally as to the sex life aspect of it."

Following that ruling the parties submitted competing orders. Both of them contained the identical language tracking that ruling. There were differences on other topics, but they are not

at issue in this motion.

Then in January, there was a second hearing. The subject was discussed. It mostly involved other issues. But the parties and the Court also addressed a small piece of the discovery that I had described in my earlier remarks, specifically that sex tapes of the plaintiff and Heather Clem -- specifically, the question was what to do with the actual sex tapes of the plaintiff and Heather Clem, other than the one that had been supplied to Gawker. Plaintiff's counsel described to the Court its earlier October 29th ruling as encompassing -- and I'm quoting here Mr. Harder's words -- "testimony and documentation that would pertain to the relationship between Hulk Hogan and Heather Clem."

Mr. Harder also proposed a compromise about what to do with the tapes, which had three parts: The first was that the tape should be preserved; the second is that they should be inspected in camera by Your Honor; and, third, that if you identified relevant parts, those parts, would be transcribed for the parties. And that would all be done under the agreed confidentiality order that's in place in the case.

Since that ruling in October, which was now a few days shy of four months ago, we have tried repeatedly to get plaintiff to comply with that piece of it. Frankly, Your Honor, there are other things that Judge Campbell has ruled on or that I would like discovery on and things that should be supplemented. But at this time, it seems like it goes to several of the plaintiff's core contentions, including when this encounter happened, what he knew about the Clems' cameras, and, by extension, the creation of this tape, and whether this encounter happened other times, and, if so, where and so forth.

1.5

We wrote letters on three separate occasions:

One is in December, one is January, one is in the first few days of February. We received no response. So after the third one, we filed this motion. In response, Hogan contends, first, that even though there was a ruling, he's not yet obligated to comply because there is no written order.

It seems pretty elementary that an oral command of the Court carries it with the expectation that it be obeyed. We've cited authority for that proposition in our papers,

which I'm happy to discuss, but I'm not going to go through the details unless Your Honor has any questions.

Hogan next contends that the ruling by

Judge Campbell in October granted his protective
order with respect to sexual relations that either
he or Heather Clem had with other people, but it
no way was intended to compel supplemental
responses with respect to sexual relations between
him and Heather Clem. Again, that does not square
with other motions or the ruling described at the
hearing or by the parties and their counsel. And
it is curious, to say the least, that no such
argument was made in response to any of our
letters.

Excuse me.

1.5

1.8

So Hogan contends that he's already provided full discovery, and there is nothing left to do.

I don't think Judge Campbell would have ruled in October granting our motion to compel supplemental discovery responses that meant the plaintiff was entitled to stand on his original responses. Although Judge Campbell has already ruled on this point, we never -- we nevertheless addressed in our papers each of the discovery

requests that are at issue to explain, once again, why plaintiff's responses have major holes in them. Unless Your Honor would like me to, I was inclined to address that only if the Court has questions or Mr. Harder raises certain points in his argument, at time for rebuttal, just in an effort to streamline things.

I would, however, like to address two documents that were supplied to us in discovery, but have been designated as confidential under the agreed protective order. If it's acceptable to Your Honor --

I'm sorry? What?

THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. BERLIN: Oh, I thought I heard somebody say something, and I didn't want to talk over them.

If it's acceptable to Your Honor and Mr. Harder, what I would like to do is ask that the rest of what I am about to say, until we go back into open session, be marked -- that that portion of the transcript be marked confidential and be bound in a separate volume so as to comply with the protective order.

Is that acceptable to Your Honor?

1.5

1.8

```
1
                THE COURT:
                            It is acceptable.
2
                And, Aaron, are you picking up on that?
3
                THE REPORTER: Yes, Judge.
4
                THE COURT:
                            Okay.
5
                MR. BERLIN: I just wanted to make sure also
6
           that Mr. Harder had no objection.
7
                MR. HARDER: Yes.
                                   This is Charles Harder.
8
           No objection.
9
                THE COURT:
                            All right.
10
                (Whereupon, by agreement of counsel,
11
           commencing at 1:40 p.m. and continuing to 1:46
12
           p.m., hearing proceedings have been marked as
13
           confidential, removed from the hearing transcript,
14
           and bound separately.)
15
                THE COURT: All right. Mr. Harder, do you
16
           want to make any comments before we move off of
17
           the confidential stuff?
18
                MR. HARDER: Sure, Your Honor.
19
                MR. BERLIN: I have no objection -- I'm
20
           sorry, Your Honor. I'm sorry to interrupt.
21
           have no objection to going back into the
22
           confidential session while Mr. Harder makes his
23
           remarks, if that would be easier.
24
                THE COURT: Okay. We'll do it that way,
25
           then.
```

All right. Then go ahead, Mr. Seth.

1.5

MR. BERLIN: In sum, Your Honor, we would ask that the plaintiff be required to provide full discovery on these topics immediately. In our opening papers, we asked for that to be by today, but, obviously, the hearing got pushed to today. And I will expect that tomorrow, realizing that's a quick turnaround, but we have depositions starting on Monday and are trying to get, with the various weather we've had up north, trying to ship all our exhibits to Florida on Thursday, you know.

And because of the shortness of time, we think we need to reserve the right to re-call the plaintiff. We will make every effort not to do so.

I also should add -- and I will add this,

Your Honor. I don't think that the discovery in

most cases needs to be an emergency. We proposed

to Mr. Harder that we would work out a less-rush

schedule for these motions for depositions and for

the balance of the case, and he ultimately refused

them and insisted that the depositions proceed.

So, as a result, we have essentially two options. We can either proceed quickly with discovery and depositions, or we could extend the

schedule. What we shouldn't have to do is have the plaintiff insist on proceeding and refuse discovery and drag his feet and then contend he can't even recall that that discovery was ordered.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Finally, Your Honor, I want to address the other relief we've requested. In my experience, the pattern of delay of obfuscation is quite serious. It's cost Gawker a lot of money, not just in terms of litigating these motions, but there are other aspects of the defense of this case.

We've been told to obtain information from other sources instead of simply receiving the discovery to which we're entitled for plaintiff. As we prepare for the depositions, we need to devote extra time to filling in the gaps that the plaintiff hasn't, because he's refused to respond to discovery ordered by Judge Campbell. there's a couple significant things he's amended at the 11th hour in his responses served on Friday, which he did under the press of a second motion. We have to recalibrate our deposition questions and exhibits and so forth.

With all due respect, Your Honor, this is not the way litigation is supposed to work.

plaintiff is not excused from discovery simply because he contends that his privacy was invaded.

Because of all this, we asked for a preclusion order. We did not ask for a contempt finding. We did not ask for a dismissal. We did not ask for plaintiff's complaint to be stricken. Instead, we asked for an appropriate sanction for his long discovery refusals, refusals that are continuing. We're asking only that he not be permitted to advance contentions at trial on subjects which he was ordered to provide discovery but has refused.

Those fall into, basically, three related points: one, that he was unaware that he was being recorded on the video at issue, that he didn't participate in making it, and he was not aware that it would be shared with and viewed by others.

Now, regardless of whether Your Honor decides that that kind of appropriately tailored sanction is warranted, at a minimum, Gawker respectfully requests an award of fees and costs to bring this motion. It should not have had to bring a second motion to compel discovery already ordered by the Court. And it should, pursuant to the applicable

rules, be awarded its reasonable fees and costs in doing so.

Unless Your Honor has any questions, I will stop, and I would ask to reserve an opportunity for a brief rebuttal.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Harder.

MR. HARDER: Yes, Judge Case. Thank you very much for the opportunity. I'm just trying to get a sense where to begin.

I'm not going to necessarily go in the order that Seth went in, but there were certain points that he made pretty strenuously that I think are pretty easy to respond to, and so I'm going to respond to those first.

Mr. Berlin seems to think that my client,
Terry Bollea, is in possession of the sex tapes
and is refusing to produce those. That's not
true. He does not have possession of any sex
tapes at all, with the exception of things that
Gawker produced for us. That's the only thing
that we have.

Terry Bollea was secretly filmed. He never received any tapes. He never received them from anyone. Gawker seems to think that this was all some sort of a plot that Terry Bollea was involved

1.5

1.8

in to try to sell a sex tape. That is simply not the case. And so all of -- a lot of what we're talking about here is just -- it's just a different reality than what was presented to you. Mr. Bollea does not have any sex tapes at all, other than that what Gawker produced.

1.5

Another thing along the same lines that
Mr. Berlin just talked about was the settlement
agreement with Bubba Clem. Bubba Clem is the
husband of Heather Clem. He and Heather
encouraged Mr. Bollea over the course of about two
years to have Mr. Bollea engage in sexual
relations with Ms. Clem. And Mr. Bollea
consistently refused for a long period of time.

And then when Mr. Bollea was separated from his wife and was in a very low point in his life, these sexual encounters took place. They were consensual with Ms. Clem, and they were orchestrated by Mr. Clem. Mr. Bollea had no idea, zero, that Mr. Clem filmed them. And, apparently, that's why these encounters were encouraged. We're just -- we're just kind of piecing it together.

So Mr. Bollea sued Mr. Clem, as well as Gawker Media, as well as Ms. Clem in connection

1 with this case. And there was an early resolution 2 of that, and we produced the settlement agreement. 3 Mr. Bollea provided to you, Your Honor, the 4 settlement. We'll have to go to confidential mode 5 while I discuss the terms of the settlement, if 6 that's okay with everybody. 7 All right. Aaron, have you got THE COURT: 8 that? 9 No objection here, Your Honor. MR. BERLIN: 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 THE REPORTER: Yes, Judge, I've got it. 12 (Whereupon, by agreement of counsel, 13 commencing at 1:53 p.m. and continuing to 1:55 14 p.m., hearing proceedings have been marked as 1.5 confidential, removed from the hearing transcript, 16 and bound separately.) 17 THE COURT: Okay. 1.8 MR. HARDER: Let's talk about the prior 19 motion to compel. Mr. Berlin was accurate when he 20 said that in June they filed document discovery 21 requests including document requests. In August 22 They filed a motion to compel we gave responses. 23 in September, and there was a hearing in October. 24 The vast, vast majority of the discovery that 25 was sought by Gawker was denied as the judge

granted our protective order on those issues. we asked for sanctions, and the judge never gave anyone any sanctions of any kind, although we completely prevailed on that. The only issue that is potentially in favor of Gawker on that is that we, the Terry Bollea side, never opposed discovery as it related to the sex tape that is at issue. And the judge slightly expanded that and said, I'm going to allow discovery regarding the relationship between Terry Bollea and Ms. Clem and the communications, although we never objected to communications with Bubba Clem regarding the sex tape at issue. But the judge slightly opened it and said, Communication regarding the sexual relationship in its entirety with Heather Clem was acceptable discovery.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what happened next was the parties couldn't agree on what the judge had ordered. I took a look at the transcript, and I took verbatim quotes, or virtually verbatim quotes, from Judge Campbell, and I created a proposed order. And then the Gawker side added a lot of text that was not in the transcript. And they said, We want this to be the protective order. And we could not come to an agreement because, from my perspective,

they were changing what the judge had said.

Specifically, when they say Judge Campbell ordered Mr. Bollea to serve further responses to discovery, the only thing that Judge Campbell ordered was a further response to Interrogatory No. 12, which gave us a specific date, and we provided a further response to Interrogatory No. 12. Judge Campbell did not order a further supplemental response as to any other interrogatories, and that includes those that are at issue in the motion.

Now, what also was going on at the time is that this hearing was in October, and the parties had scheduled deposition in November. So it was coming right up, that there were going to be depositions. And I think Your Honor may even recall where my office was saying we had blocked these dates off for depositions four months in advance, and we want to proceed with the depositions so we can get them out of the way.

It's not easy to schedule all of these depositions. It was not easy to do it four months in advance and then just resetting them. I even said it's probably going to another four months to get them back on calendar, especially with the

holiday, in the order in which Gawker wanted to take them. And I was assuming -- and I think perhaps Judge Campbell was assuming -- that when she made that order that certain -- that a certain scope was permissible discovery, that the next phase was going to be Gawker asking Mr. Bollea at a deposition, which was scheduled, I think, a couple of weeks later -- I think his deposition was scheduled the week of November 12th, and this hearing was October 29th.

So the next phase would be Gawker asking questions of Mr. Bollea, When did you have your encounters with Ms. Clem? What communications did you have with Ms. Clem and with Mr. Clem regarding these encounters? Questions about the sex tape:

Did you know about it? Did you authorize it? Did you participate in it, and things like that, and the answers, obviously, to all those questions.

Well, what happened was the depositions got postponed. And then the holidays came, and then we recalendared all of the depositions, and then new discovery came in from Gawker. And then I received several meet-and-confers all in a row from Mr. Berlin. I expected we were going to have a phone conference about them. And, instead, he

filed three motions to compel within about a week of his meet-and-confer letters without having a conference first.

I then said, Seth, why don't we have a conference about this.

And he said, Okay.

Or maybe he suggested it, and I said okay.

But we had a conference. And the only thing -the only thing that is responsive, that there is
anything new is three sentences that we provided
in a further response to No. 9, which said -- it's
three sentences. It says -- and Your Honor has
them. I have been working off of memory as to
what it says, but it's, essentially, these are the
times that Mr. Bollea and Ms. Clem had their
encounters.

Otherwise -- and then it's No. 10. We had provided that response to No. 10 way back in August, except we had a date wrong. Instead of 2008, it was mid 2007. And I apologize. And this is actually -- and Seth is correct -- the second time I have made an apology about the dates. I'm trying to get it right. It's difficult when I have a client who does not have documents pertaining to these things, pertaining to when

1.5

things occurred, and he's working off of his memory. And I get information as to when things occurred based upon his memory, and it turns out that we have to make a slight adjustment to the date because we find out things.

So the only reason I'm kind of dancing around this is I can't divulge attorney-client privileged communications, so I have to avoid that. But it's unfortunate. If I had -- if I could go into my time machine and go back, I would have put the correct dates in from the very beginning, which is -- it's approximately mid 2007.

In any event -- in any event, we provided a supplemental response to 9, which states when the sexual encounters occurred, and we provided a supplemental response to 10, which changed the date. But, otherwise, back in August, we had said the communications that Mr. Bollea can remember having with the Clems. He can't remember every single conversation he ever had with them, but what we put in there is what he can remember.

In terms of documents, he doesn't have any.

He doesn't have any documents other than -- I

mean, we've produced some texts, and we produced

them way back in August. These are texts from --

I think it was around April-ish of 2012, and we produced those. We're not holding back on anything, except communications between Mr. Bollea and litigation counsel, obviously. But I have an agreement with Seth that neither side is going to be logging litigation communications. We're talking about things that happened before litigation counsel was retained for this.

But this whole notion that Mr. Bollea or his counsel -- myself, and maybe others -- are engaged in some sort of a scheme or to try to hide the ball, try to hide things, that's just not the case. I mean, we have been fully producing documents. There aren't a lot.

As you can probably imagine, if you're ever in a bedroom and you're filmed without your knowledge and then six years later you find out that a highlight reel of the activity is up on the Internet and you think back, Okay, what kind of documents do I have relating to the things that happened from the past six years about this sex tape, you're not going to have much, if anything at all. And that just happens to be the case. So it's not that we're hiding anything or trying to prevent anything. A lot of this stuff just

1.5

doesn't exist.

1.5

1.8

I would also like to -- I'm looking at my notes, Your Honor, because I want to make sure I address as much as I can of what Mr. Berlin said.

He said that we're taking the position that the judge never made a ruling. I'm not really taking a position that the judge never made a ruling. I'm saying that because there were conflicting proposed orders and she never entered one, I'm not entirely sure what I need to comply with and what I don't, except for what she said at the hearing.

And what she said at the hearing is that the activities between Mr. Bollea and Ms. Clem are fair game for discovery, and Mr. Bollea was required to, compelled to do a further response to Interrogatory No. 12, which is not at issue in these motions, and we did that. There is no other order compelling him to do a further response to any of the interrogatories. And perhaps the reason was because we were about to go in the deposition. So I kind of covered that.

There is another issue here, which is that some of Gawker's discovery asks for things that happened up until 2006, and some of their

happened up until 2006, and s

discovery asks for things that happened all the way until present day. And so we responded to what was asked of us.

So if activities of 2006 were requested, we provided that. If activities going all the way to the present were requested, we provided that. One of the things here is that -- is that Gawker never asked us as to some of these activities. And they were when Mr. Bollea visited the Clems' house. So I will get more specific. The interrogatories 15, 16, and 17 say, Provide us details when Mr. Bollea visited the Clems' residence between twenty -- I'm sorry, 2002 and 2006.

And we provided the information that he could recall. So we're going back 8 to 12 years.

That's the time frame, 8 to 12 years. And it's just very general. Every single time he ever came to the Clems' residence, did he ever sleep overnight? Did he ever walk into the bedroom?

And the responses aren't particularly detailed because he can't remember every single time, and he doesn't remember if he walked into a bedroom or didn't walk into a bedroom or if he slept overnight or didn't sleep overnight 12 to 8 -- I'm sorry -- 8 to 12 years ago.

One of the problems, though, is that Gawker never asked us for the same information after 2006, and it could have within the past several months. And the motion to compel is seeking information after 2006 when the interrogatory itself doesn't ask for information after 2006.

And the judge -- excuse me -- Judge Campbell never ordered us to supplement these interrogatories at all and never said, You need to provide this specific information after 2006.

Again, I'm just checking my notes. I just want to make sure I cover everything.

In terms of the sanction, the reply brief says that we didn't say anything in our position to objecting to sanctions. And if you take a look at our opposition, it actually is -- it goes on for several pages saying sanctions are not warranted here, monetary or preclusion order.

The preclusion order just -- I can't imagine how a preclusion order could be ordered in something like this where the order that they're trying to seek is to change reality. They're trying to take things that didn't exist and make them so. Mr. Bollea was secretly filmed, but they want a preclusion order that he can't say that in

1.5

trial, that he can't testify to the truth. I don't see how that's warranted at all.

As far as monetary sanctions, I don't see how that's warranted. At the very least, I think we're substantially justified in the way that things have occurred because Judge Campbell is still taking under submission the parties' conflicting proposed orders.

We have depositions that are coming up next week, that Gawker is going to have two days to ask questions of Mr. Bollea. Are you sure it happened this year and not that year? Are you sure that you didn't sleep over at the Clems' house in 2002 or '3 or '4 or '5? I mean, they are going to have two days' worth of questions to ask, so they have plenty of opportunities to obtain more information.

This isn't their last opportunity. This is -- they still have plenty of chances to ask him questions directly face to face in light of the information that we have provided, which is the information that he can recall. These things happened a long time ago, and he does not have total recall of them, and he doesn't have documents that would help him refresh things.

MR. TURKEL: Judge, if I can hop in. I don't know if Charles is done. There were two things that --

THE REPORTER: Who is speaking, please?

MR. TURKEL: It's Ken Turkel. I don't know if Charles is done yet.

MR. HARDER: Go ahead.

1.5

MR. TURKEL: Judge, I just have two points.

And, you know, I generally sit silent on these
things as local counsel, but there is just a
couple points under Florida law, and I don't know
that we cited these exact cases, but I know Your
Honor is familiar with them.

Interrogatories are not meant to supplant deposition, you know. Rules of civil procedure require the least burdensome route of discovery tailored to the specific facts of the case. There is case law out there -- I think Cabrera vs. Evans is one of the cases. It says very clearly that it's not incumbent upon one party to do the investigation for another party.

And after reading the briefs, both our opposition brief and their initial brief, the issue presented by them is an issue that they have gotten no reply. So, in essence, they have gotten

a reply; they just don't like them. And the whole purpose of a deposition -- you know, interrogatories are largely framed to get objective information. Theirs were fairly broad. We vetted them out with Judge Campbell.

The idea is you take those to the deposition, of which they have two full days. There was even a dig in one of their motions about the idea that we fought to restrict them to one full day, which is completely reasonable I think in almost any but the most complex of business cases. And we've lost that as if that was some sort of obstruction tactic to advocate for our client to try and restrict a depo to one day. Under the federal rules that's all you get is a default setting. Anything past that is an exception.

And so --

1.5

1.8

MR. BERLIN: Your Honor? Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt. This is Seth Berliner.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERLIN: I'm very sorry to interrupt.

I was under the impression that, you know, one person per each side would speak. And Mr. Turkel is now going on about cases that are not cited, and we haven't gotten copies. He's not

cited them. I just would like -- Your Honor, obviously, will do whatever you're going to do, but I would just like to lodge an objection to that, to both those things, and then I will be quiet.

MR. TURKEL: Judge, to be honest, I've probably talked on these various discovery hearings a total of ten minutes. And to be quite clear, Judge, when someone is seeking sanctions and is making these sort of pejorative comments and I'm counsel of record, I feel like I have a right to respond.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. TURKEL: And I don't have much more to respond to, and I'll be done, and they get a rebuttal.

But I think the point is, Judge, the rules of civil procedure are at issue. And 1.280 is very clear that someone is supposed to use the least burdensome route of discovery. And it's not our job to do their investigation for them nip and tuck on interrogatories. That's the whole purpose of allowing an alternative deposition, at which you're going to be present. You're going to be capable of hearing this and monitoring any

objections as to whether they are proper in scope or otherwise.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, you know, Judge Campbell literally told us -- and this is in your briefs, Your Honor -when there is competing orders, she takes copious notes, and then she will look at the competings and look at her order -- or her notes, and do her own order.

And so we're sitting here vetting this out as if some horrific discovery violations occurred. Well, we haven't gotten her final version of the order. Mr. Harder has made it clear in our papers we provided responses that they, obviously, don't like, but that's not the stuff of which motions to compel are made of.

And one, in essence, is a motion in limine in this stage of the case to preclude testimony of something that we haven't even gotten a final order on, as well as a request for the fees. Ι mean, Judge, it's hard, I understand, that in a vacuum to get these disputes compartmentalized. But we've had our fair share of issues with their conduct in discovery also.

And in whole I think -- and I know Charles has made that point -- but these are, you know, one, directed, really, at the quality of answers, not the existence of answers. And, two, their sanctions and preclusionary, essentially, Judge, is an in limine request and is grossly premature in this case, given the fact that, Your Honor, that you're going to be in a position to sit there and listen to the testimony against the interrogatory answers and/or documents in production they have received.

At the very least, Judge, I think that you're in a position to perhaps reserve to let
Judge Campbell issue the final written order on this after she consults her own notes and two competing orders and to see if the context of the actual deposition -- which, you know, I'm still a little bit confused as to the idea that someone is saying our attempts to limit it to one day were somehow obstructionary, when, in essence, we're just advocating for our client who is, obviously, a national celebrity, and, you know, one day is a lot for him, and they've got two.

So I think the context and the tone of the arguments belies what's actually happened here,

Judge, in a lot of respects and that any order right now would be both inappropriate given the

state of what we have provided and the procedural status of the case. That's what I have got.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Berlin?

MR. BERLIN: Your Honor, I'll try and be brief.

I think there seems to be an agreement, which is confirmed on this call, what the scope of Judge Campbell said, the scope of discovery, should be, and everybody agrees on that. Let me address one. This issue of the year, which is sort of something that Mr. Harder spoke to. It addresses the scope. Let me speak to that, if I may.

We wrote in our motion to compel -- and Your Honor has binders of these materials so you can look at those. We wrote in our motion to compel a specific request that the discovery responses be amended because there was this ambiguity of the year, which came after the complaint and after the discovery was served.

And your ruling -- which everybody agrees the ruling is not limited now from 2002 to the present. It was attempted to obviate that problem. So we went from 2006 to 2008 and now to 2007. Judge Campbell just said, Look, the

relevant period is 2002 to the present. That's the scope of the questions. All right. And so that should be clear.

Now, if for some reason it was the plaintiff's position that despite having been told by Judge Campbell that is now the relevant scope of time, the relevant time period, that they objected to that in some way, the time to say that -- because we've been writing letters about this. We had a hearing, obviously, in October, at the end of October, but we wrote a letter on the 12th of December. We wrote a follow-up on the 6th of January. We wrote a follow-up on the 5th of February. We heard nothing, you know, crickets, radio silence, nothing, nada. And, you know, that's not how this process is supposed to work.

Now, it comes with an order, right? The way -- Mr. Harder said the parties couldn't come to an agreement on the order. I would like to make two points about this.

One is, as it pertains to the substance of this motion and this discovery, there is no dispute in the order. The transcript, their order, our order, they were -- there was no question of what happened in October, at the

January hearing. We're all in agreement, right?

The only -- the only -- there are other things that are at issue in that order where the parties couldn't come to an agreement. But I would like to just say that in that instance, it is correct that Mr. Harder drafted an order. He sent it to us. We sent it back with some suggested modifications. They are not extreme, but there are differences, and I concede that based on what we thought the judge had done.

Again, on other topics, we never heard back from Mr. Harder. At that point, he submitted his order and we were left to submit our order. So the notion that the parties could, quote, unquote, come to an agreement is illustrative of how this has gone in the sense that we didn't even have -- you know, he didn't call us up; he didn't write us back. It was just, Here, Judge Campbell. They sent this back with changes that we don't agree with. And because we assume we won't be able to reach any agreement, we're sending you our own order. I believe Your Honor may have those e-mails in the binders. I'm really not sure.

But for present purposes, the substance of the order is exactly the same, and, therefore, it should not be something where you're saying, Jeez, we don't know what Judge Campbell is going to do on this point. And I guess it's theoretically possible that she will, despite what she said in two hearings and what both parties memorialized identically. We will see if she will change that, but that's not really likely. Yet at some point we have to move forward. That's one of the reasons why she appointed you, Your Honor.

1.5

1.8

In terms of the discovery itself, you know, what we're being told is, I cannot possibly identify with any specificity any communications that I had with Mr. Clem about my sexual relationship with Heather Clem either from the time period that it happened, whether it's 2006, 2008, or 2007.

I can't identify any communications between that and 2012. I can't identify any communications or describe any communications that happened when there was the first reports of the sex tape in March and April of 2012. I can't identify any communications between then and October 2012 when Gawker published its story. I can't identify any communications after Gawker published the story but before Mr. Hogan sued

Mr. Clem. I can't identify any communications after that time, and I can't identify any communications since.

With respect, Your Honor, I have to say, you know, in responding to Mr. Turkel's point about we should do the discovery in the most efficient way, the most efficient way is to be able to find out what we can using written discovery. And that was the whole pitch that Mr. Harder made to me during our last telephone conversation, was that you're supposed to use written discovery first so that you can narrow the depositions.

That's exactly what we've tried to do here.

And instead of getting your reasonable response -and, again, I don't expect everybody to remember
everything that ever happened. That's not true in
my life, as my wife could tell you. But I do
expect that somebody would give more than the very
paltry information that's been provided.

Interrogatories 15, 16, and 17 ask if he lived there and asked if he slept there.

He said, I may have slept there.

It asked if he's been in the bedroom.

I may have been in the bedroom.

With respect, given the facts that are known

1.5

1.8

to us that have been conceded already, these responses are bordering on, you know, bad faith because they are not telling -- they're not even making a reasonable effort to tell the whole truth about what's going on.

Responses about, you know, communications for a document request number 8, 9, and 11, which has to do with documents related to the sexual relationship with Mrs. Clem, you know. We have the communications that we just talked about. We have his media appearances, which are really the subject of the next motion, but would also be responsive to this.

We have his complaint for enforcement, which is also the subject of the next motion but would be responsive to this. For Interrogatories 4 and 5, which is information regarding other tapes, you know -- I think it was March, but it might have been April. The plaintiff appeared with David Houston, who is also counsel in this case, appeared on TMZ where they were asked about the content of the tape that they now know is not on Gawker's tape, because we don't have it, and there is no information provided about that whatsoever.

And then, of course, there is the tapes

themselves, which would be covered by document requests 12 and 13. And, you know, speaking to the settlement through this portion, I would like to apologize to the court reporter who has gone on and off the confidential session. I would like to just briefly go into confidential session once more to just say that the settlement agreement -- if the settlement agreement -- is that okay, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Whereupon, by agreement of counsel, commencing at 2:22 p.m. and continuing to 2:24 p.m., hearing proceedings have been marked as confidential, removed from the hearing transcript, and bound separately.)

MR. BERLIN: And as far as the sanctions, any kind of preclusion order, obviously, changes the nature of the evidence. And the whole point of a preclusion order is not to state a change in reality, because that's assuming that what Mr. Harder is describing is, in fact, reality. The whole point of the adversarial process is that we're entitled to take their allegations, which are allegations and test them through the discovery process. And that cross-examination and

testing is what leads to truth. And when you corrupt that process by not providing your end of the bargain, that is exactly why a preclusion order is proper, because what it does is it precludes the other side from saying, This is the reality, without allowing Gawker or the other defendants to test that.

And that's why we asked for that. We didn't ask for it on every issue in the case or every fact in the case. We didn't ask for a dismissal. We didn't ask for all of that. We just asked for it on the specific subjects that there has been discovery refused.

And, you know, we do believe that taking document discovery and written discovery before taking depositions is appropriate and is, in fact, to pick up with, as I understood

Mr. Turkel's remarks and without seeing the case he cited, to be an efficient way of proceeding and is particularly appropriate where there has been a limitation placed on the length of time for which the deposition can presumptively proceed.

And then, lastly, it was not my intent -- I mean, before I get to "lastly," it should not be the case that -- you know, the plaintiff's

argument is, essentially, with respect to the deposition, you know, we're entitled to leave you out on the written discovery because your remedy is that you get to come and sit two days asking our client questions. And that, with respect, Your Honor, is not how discovery is supposed to go in Florida or anywhere else that I have had the privilege of practicing.

With respect -- and then the last point I will make is that we did not argue that they did not address sanctions. What we addressed was that they did not address attorney's fees, and that is not -- that was not opposed in our opposition.

But we think that, at a minimum, given that you have to file two motions even just to extract the last two interrogatory responses that we got, both of which make substantive and material changes to the core of their case, even if we got nothing else but just getting that information by having to file two motions and to take two hearings and three letters would warrant an award of attorney's fees under these circumstances.

At this point I have nothing to add. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. HARDER: And, Your Honor, this is Charles

1.5

1.8

Harder, if I could have just a couple of minutes just to address those points.

MR. BERLIN: Before Mr. Harder speaks, Your Honor, it occurred to me that I went briefly into the settlement agreement and didn't go back into the public session. This happened once before. And I might ask that when we look at the transcript -- and I think it will be obvious to the reporter -- that we might just propose before finalizing the transcript where that should be, go back onto public session, and then Mr. Harder and I, you know, should be able to agree on that. if not, Your Honor can certainly direct that most of what I just said was meant to be a public session. It was just that brief comment about the specific confidential document. But I apologize for -- to the reporter for not taking better order of the transcript.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Harder?

MR. HARDER: Yes, Judge Case. Thank you.

As far as the monetary things, we did oppose the monetary sanctions. We cited cases in our opposition as to why monetary sanctions were not applicable here. So when Mr. Berlin in his papers and now is saying that we didn't do it, we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

actually did. We would request that you take a close look at what we provided.

As far as Mr. Berlin's comments, he says they wrote a whole bunch of letters over the course of a long period of time and heard nothing.

Mr. Berlin and I have been litigating this case for about 16 months now. And so what we -- the practice that we have been doing is that we will send one another a meet-and-confer letter, and then after a certain period of time to allow the person to digest it, we will send an e-mail saying, Seth -- or he will say "Charles" -- when is a good time for you to talk about the content of my letter? And then I will or he will make ourselves available to talk about the contents so that we can have a meet-and-confer conference before we have a motion.

That wasn't followed here, except the e-mail that came from Seth asking me for a conversation about this took place after their motion was filed and not before. And the motion was filed, I think, exactly seven days, with a weekend in between, after the letter had come with another letter and then another letter about a whole bunch of different issues. So there are now three

discovery motions that are pending. And I have got letters on all of those, as well as letters about a whole bunch of other things, because I get all kinds of letters from Seth's office.

So I would have been happy to have a meet-and-confer conference with him before this motion was filed. And the result would have been that we would have talked about this, and he would have pointed out that we needed to provide him with some information as to interrogatory 9, and I would have said, Yes, I agree with you there. And that's exactly what we did.

One of the problems that we're dealing with is that we both submitted orders to

Judge Campbell, and she hasn't ordered anything

yet, although it's under submission. But her

hearing transcript said that our -- it's a little

confusing, because she says that our objections to

interrogatory 9 are sustained, and at the same

time she says, But I'm going to allow questions of

Mr. Bollea as to the relationship with Heather

Clem.

I think that was contemplating that the deposition was happening such that it sounded like the judge was not ordering us to do a further

response to No. 9, and she never did say, You have to do a further response to No. 9. She said, You have to do a further response to No. 12. And we did that, and that's not at issue. She never said No. 9. So this motion to compel us to do a further response to No. 9 based on the hearing transcript is just not there in the transcript.

Nevertheless, just to clarify this, in my meet-and-confer conference with Mr. Berlin six days ago, which took place after the motion was filed, I said, I will get you a further response to No. 9 just so that you have it, but not because I was ordered, but because I'm going to give it to you. And we did that. It was three sentences.

Your Honor, they also talk about our response to No. 10. I don't know if they ever provided you our response to No. 10, and I don't know if I provided you our response to No. 10. I can't remember. It goes on and on about the communication.

So when Mr. Berlin, five minutes ago, says we've completely stonewalled him and never gave any communications of any kind, that's not accurate. I have 15 lines describing communications that took place in the period

1.5

around 2006, 2007, possibly 2008 -- I think that there was that confusion about the date -- but communications that took place over a course of two years leading up to the encounters that are at issue.

1.5

1.8

And then also in the spring of 2012, when TMZ wrote an article about the possibility of there being a sex tape out there, without identifying anyone who was involved in it, we provided information about that. Mr. Bollea asked Mr. Clem to explain. And I'm reading from our response. Mr. Bollea asked Mr. Clem to explain the media reports regarding allegations of a possible sex tape involving Mr. Bollea. Mr. Clem denied having any knowledge of or involvement in the sex tape. At no time prior to or during the sexual encounter -- now I'm starting to paraphrase. There is plenty more stuff. I'm just trying to be efficient with the time.

We provided them with the communications that happened, with Mr. Bollea's recollection of communications that have occurred over the course of an eight-year period. He can't remember every phone call that he had. He can't remember every time he texted. He can't remember certain things

and to say when they happened, because this happened a long time ago and this was not the most important thing that's ever happened to him in his life.

We have provided his texts. Those were the things that he has, and so we produced them. We did provide a summary of what he can recall about the communications. If you were to order a further response, I don't know what we would provide you, Your Honor, in response to No. 10 or in response to No. 9, because as far as I can tell, we have provided a full response of Mr. Bollea's memory. He doesn't have documents, other than those we have produced, that would allow him to refresh any other recollections. He doesn't do e-mails, and he on occasion does texts, but it's -- it's not very often. He's not a big document type of person.

So leading into this request for sanctions -well, before I get there, the reasonableness of
the response, I really think this is a situation
where Gawker wants more information than we are
capable of providing. And that's what the whole
motion to compel is about. But I don't know how
we can provide more information beyond what is in

our -- in Mr. Bollea's brain or beyond the documents that we've already produced.

And as far as interrogatories 15 and 16, and 17, the time period in the interrogatories themselves -- and I think that Gawker didn't provide the interrogatories. The interrogatories limit the time period to 2006. If Mr. Berlin wanted me to provide the information after 2006, he could have given me another interrogatory or we could have had a conversation where he said, You know what, I realize it says 2006. Let's -- can you please supplement to go beyond? And I would have been happy to do that. But, instead, he files a motion that compels me to go beyond what his interrogatory says. And I don't think that's the right way of doing it, and I certainly don't think that that's sanctionable.

If you look at the request for sanctions, I don't think it's appropriate in any way. The motion didn't need to be filed. And even if -- even with the motion in our responses, our responses are pretty much full and complete. I can't see how we can give any more information than we've already given.

As of today -- and it's not because they

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

filed a motion, and it's not because the judge made the comment that she gave; it's because we have actually been forthcoming with the information that we have. We have produced documents. I haven't gone through all the different documents that we've produced, but whatever we have that's not privileged, we have provided.

1.5

So sanctions, monetary ones, are not appropriate here, Your Honor, because

Judge Campbell did not order a further response to any of the discovery that's at issue here, and we have been forthcoming with information. And when Mr. Berlin did get on the phone with me after he filed the motion, we did have a conversation. And I told him I was going to get him further information, the three sentences in interrogatory 9 relating to the occasions where Mr. Bollea and Ms. Clem had sexual relations.

And that's all I have. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERLIN: Your Honor, if I may just -- I'm not going to address the bulk of what Mr. Harder just spoke about in terms of the conferring and writing letters and not responding, because I

think that I made my position clear. I could say more about it, but I don't think it's going to add to this.

I did want to just speak to two things. One is just as an example, this Interrogatory No. 10. If you were to sit down and read the couple of --you know, it's about two short paragraphs. If you were to read it, a lot of it is just advocacy. It doesn't actually answer questions. In other words, we asked about what are the actual communications. There is a couple sentences in there that said, We had communications, in a very generalized way. But it doesn't -- there is a number of sentences that talk about, you know, what they said, what they didn't say, and, you know, what they would have done had something been said and something had been done.

I mean, that's not really what we're talking about. And the related -- and I know this bleeds over to the next motion, but just as example, Your Honor, you know, because we got such a barebones response, we asked them for telephone records. And, you know, one thing that you could do, because we all have a cell phone in the modern age and they keep track of who you call and who you

text, is to sit down and look at that and say,

Ah-ha, I now have information that I can give in
an interrogatory question or in a document request

about when I sent texts and when I sent phone

calls to the people that are key players in this

case. And --

MR. HARDER: And, Your Honor, this is Charles Harder. I apologize for interrupting --

MR. BERLIN: Your Honor --

MR. HARDER: -- but that's the next motion.

We can maybe wrap up this motion and go on to the next motion.

THE COURT: Mr. Harder, I --

MR. BERLIN: Well, I would like to wrap up.

I just wanted to use that as an illustration of what's -- even without asking for phone records, which we've now asked for because we've gotten this response, a party in this situation could go to their phone or account online and pull the records, and you can sit down and look at them, and then you can answer those questions.

And so when you say, We don't have any ability to do anything more, I really think that that's hard to swallow. And that's the only point I wanted to make. But I'm otherwise happy to

reserve on the questions of the phone records themselves to the next motion. But I wanted to use that as an illustration of something that could have and should have been done.

But after that, I will stop.

MR. HARDER: Your Honor, if I can address that for 30 seconds. That's a new issue.

If Mr. Berlin had asked us to have Mr. Bollea do that and to see if his phone records refreshed his recollection so that he could provide even more information than he already has regarding interrogatory No. 10, I would have been happy to do it.

But, instead, what I get are motions to compel and motions to compel and motions to compel. And it's just, in my view, not the right way of doing it. I'm happy to provide the information. We've been doing it for 16 months now. We've been providing information.

MR. BERLIN: I'm sorry to laugh, Your Honor. These are -- its not motions and motions; it's letters and letters trying to engage and then receive no response. So I think Your Honor has the picture. I don't need to belabor the point.

MR. HARDER: And, frankly, on the issue of

phone records, I would be happy to have Mr. Bollea take a look at his phone records from 2012 and see if it refreshes his recollection on communications that he had with the Clems'. And I will supplement it. And I think that that's the appropriate way of addressing the phone records, rather than to force him to produce an entire year of phone records to Gawker, which is a media company that publishes things about people.

1.5

1.8

THE COURT: Okay. With respect to defendant's expedited motion to compel plaintiff's compliance with the October 29th discovery rulings and for sanctions, the recommendation to Judge Campbell on this issue would be to deny the motion with a very strong caveat. And, that is, Mr. Harder, I'm taking you for your word and your client's word that he does not have any of the information, that you have represented that he does not, and that he doesn't have access to it and that he's incapable of furnishing any of the discovery that you have represented.

Subsequently to today, if determined that he has been less than candid or honest with these proceedings and with this Court, I think you can fully expect the recommendation from me to

1 Judge Campbell in the strongest of words that a 2 preclusion order would be entered with respect to 3 what the defendant is seeking here today. I'm not 4 going to do it today, because, as I said, I'm 5 taking you and your client's word with respect to 6 your abilities to provide the discovery and have 7 been completed as far as they can possibly be. 8 So that being said, the other sanction 9 request will be denied. Motion to compel the 10 discovery will be denied. 11 MR. BERLIN: Your Honor, if we might, to the 12 extent of doing an order, that Mr. Harder is going 13 to do what he said he was going to do with respect 14 to the phone records. 1.5 THE COURT: I think that's going to come up 16 next. 17 Well, the next one actually asks MR. BERLIN: 18 for them to be produced. What he was offering to 19 do was to have his client review them. 20 That was -- if I understand THE COURT: 21 Mr. Harder correctly, that offer was in lieu of 22 producing the records. 23 MR. HARDER: Correct. 24 THE COURT: And I don't --25 MR. BERLIN: They're not going --I'm sorry,

Your Honor. I'll be happy to address it in the next motion. But it would seem appropriate that regardless of whether he produces them or not, if they have records that would help them answer a question, in light of what Your Honor just said, that they would be obliged to do that. And that's why I was asking.

THE COURT: That might be helpful if he brought them to the deposition next week, but that's not -- that's not in front of me right now, anyway.

All right. Moving along.

MR. BERLIN: All right. So the next motion, Your Honor, is a motion to compel discovery. We served six discovery requests in December. Those discovery requests were -- some of them actually picked up on some earlier requests from last June, and we tried to narrow them in response to some of the objections that have been expressed by Mr. Harder at the October hearing, basic information designed to follow up on the discovery and investigation to try and illuminate some more detail about communications that the plaintiff may have had with key players in this case either by text or by phone call.

There should have been no difficulty in getting responses to six requests before depositions in March, and the request essentially falls into three categories.

The first category seeks documents and information concerning Hogan's many media appearances. And, again, this is the kind of thing where -- and this is also, as I said in my last argument, responses to the other requests, but there is a specific request pertaining to this.

After the Gawker story was published, Hogan went on a major media tour. And the 10-day window between when Gawker published his story and when he filed this lawsuit, Hogan appeared on the Today Show, the Howard Stern show, Piers Morgan's show on CNN, TMZ Live, and then an interview published in USA Today, as well as a number of other media outlets and they discussed the sex tape and the Gawker story and all of that.

Now, we have been able to see the results of the stories, but there is a lot of stuff that's presumably going on behind the scenes.

In connection with all that, he used the services of a New York-based publicist, Elizabeth

Rosenthal Traub -- for the court reporter's benefit, that's T-r-a-u-b -- and her agency, which was called EJ Media.

Hogan has produced no documents about those media appearances, including his publicist has with bookers, producers, reporters, or others. He has produced no schedules, no talking points, no calendar entries, no travel receipts, no notes. He's produced no communications with his publicist, be they e-mails, text, memos, not even the agreement that -- of when he engaged her.

Obviously, as recognized by the Second DCA in its recent opinion, what Hogan said publicly about the very subject at hand is relevant to two related ways.

First, Hogan's statements about the underlying facts are obviously relevant particularly in light of the story that has continued to shift in a variety of ways.

Second, Hogan's publicity efforts are relevant to his claims for invasion of privacy, and his claims for emotional distress on his intentional and negligent infliction claims, and, of course, his right of publicity claim.

As noted in our papers, Gawker also had to

cover its bases by subpoenaing Hogan's publicist, Ms. Traub and her firm directly, even though we believe that her documents are within his possession, custody, or control.

As it stands now, Ms. Traub and her firm have been ordered to appear on Wednesday morning,

February 26th, and to show cause why they should not be required to provide full responses to the subpoenas. We'd also ask Your Honor to require plaintiff to produce all documents within his possession, custody, or control.

We've asked for Hogan's and his counsel's communication with the FBI and other law enforcement agencies. Your Honor, you've already heard a detailed argument on plaintiff's claim of privilege about this in our last hearing a couple weeks ago, and I will not rehash that now unless Your Honor has any questions.

I would add that even if there were a law enforcement privilege and even if that's what the plaintiff asserted, it would not apply to the narrow category of plaintiff's own communications with the FBI or those of his counsel with the FBI.

I will give an example. So, for example, a grand jury, under federal civil procedure -- or

1.5

criminal procedure 6(e) -- I'm sorry -- or the equivalent in Florida, the proceedings are secret, even more so than an FBI file, which can be obtained through a FOIA request.

But in the absence of a gag order, plaintiff has made no claim here that he is under one. A witness, including a complaining witness, is free to disclose and discuss her testimony, his or her testimony. In D.C., where I live, I have clear memories of people like Monica Lewinsky, Vernon Jordan and other witnesses appearing for testimony before a grand jury and then immediately afterwards taking to the microphones in front of the courthouse to discuss with the media their appearance.

And just as those people are not precluded from doing so, there is no basis to preclude Hogan and his counsel from disclosing their communications. Ultimately, we request the plaintiff be directed to immediately provide full responses to areas in Interrogatory No. 9 and Gawker's request for production No. 52.

And for the avoidance of any doubt, if the plaintiff asserts that any such documents are protected by the attorney-client privilege or the

1.5

1.8

attorney work product doctrine, in other words, communications between him and his counsel and that predate the filing of the lawsuit, we ask that those — that the plaintiff be directed to immediately provide a privilege log so that those claims can be evaluated and, if necessary, addressed by Your Honor.

Finally, we request the plaintiff provide account information for his cell phone or accounts -- cell phone account or accounts, if he has more than one, used through 2012 and records of numbers called and texted during that period.

As we said in our papers, we have no intention of calling those numbers, but we have got a situation here where the plaintiff contends that he can't remember much about his communications even with key players such as Bubba Clem.

We're asking for these records to assist in our ability to ask witnesses about their communications with one another and other related parties and to assess plaintiff's contentions about his communications. Those include his communications with Heather and Bubba Clem during the period when reports about a sex tape first

surfaced in March and April 2012 and that the Gawker story published in early October of 2012, and then later that month when Hogan and Mr. Clem had a falling out publicly and ended up in litigation and then quickly settled.

There are similar orders in similar situations which we cited in our papers. And the plaintiff here should be required to produce the information and documents in these narrow requests, specifically interrogatory No. 10 and request for production No. 54.

And I will reserve some time for rebuttal, but that's -- I wanted to try and keep this part of it brief.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Harder?

MR. HARDER: Yes, thank you, Judge Case. I will take them in different order. Let's start with the phone record, because we have already started talking about that.

I think that a reasonable accomodation would be to have Mr. Bollea review his phone records and then to provide a supplemental response that would identify any phone calls that happened to be on his phone records with Bubba or Heather Clem. I don't think it would be appropriate for me to

identify phone calls that he has had with his litigation counsel, because those will probably show up in the 2012 phone records.

1.5

Beyond communications with litigation counsel and litigation and Bubba and Bubba and Heather Clem, I don't know that there is going to be anything in the phone records that's pertinent to the case.

Mr. Berlin just said that we didn't provide any of the information about his 2012 communications with Bubba Clem. And that actually is not totally accurate, because in our response to Interrogatory No. 10, we say, In or about spring 2012, Mr. Bollea asked Mr. Clem to explain the media reports regarding allegations of a possible sex tape involving Mr. Bollea. Mr. Clem denied having any knowledge or involvement in the sex tape.

So we identified that. I don't know why a phone record is necessary, because we identified it.

As far as all of the phone calls that have ever been made to Mr. Bollea or from Mr. Bollea in the year 2012, obviously, we're talking about 99-percent-plus phone calls that have nothing at

all to do with this case. So I just don't think that any of that is appropriate, especially when it's not like we are withholding information. We are providing information.

Also, I mentioned earlier, about a half hour ago, there were texts between Terry Bollea and Mr. Clem on the subject of, What is all this about a possible sex tape? We've produced those texts, so Gawker has those texts. So everything that we have we've produced.

But, again, I'm happy to have Mr. Bollea -and going off of Mr. Berlin's statement that a
person who has a telephone account can go into his
account and look at the account for phone calls to
somebody -- a certain number or from a certain
number, if it's that easy, this is going to be
very easy. We can identify the phone company.

I don't even mind identifying by date and by phone -- well, I would rather not identify by phone number, but just say a phone call was made to or a phone call was made from Mr. Clem's phone or Terry Bollea to Mr. Clem or Mr. Clem to Terry Bollea and the duration of that call and the time in which that call took place.

I don't have any problem with that. I just

1.5

don't want to open the floodgates to all phone calls that Mr. Bollea has ever had. I just think that is completely inappropriate and not called for, and it seeks things that are not relevant, and it invades Mr. Bollea's privacy. So I think that a reasonable accommodation could be reached there.

As far as the FBI records, we kind of went back and forth on this about -- what was it, a few weeks ago? And Your Honor made the recommendation to Judge Campbell. And with respect, Your Honor, we filed an exception because we feel that the law reads a certain way that we don't think that the discovery should occur. But Judge Campbell has a hearing scheduled on that issue for April 23rd, which is her earliest availability. So we will have her revisit that issue.

So as far as the FBI records and Mr. Bollea's communications with the FBI, which are all part of the same thing, we would recommend that

Judge Campbell hear all of this, and whatever your recommendation may be, on the date of the hearing that's been scheduled, which is April 23rd.

As far as the media appearances, Mr. Berlin makes it sound like we're, again, we're hiding

things. And again, that's not the case.

Mr. Bollea uses a publicist for certain things. This is not a publicist for all purposes necessarily. When Mr. Bollea was doing a media tour in early October, it was because he was promoting a Pay-per-view wrestling event. He had no knowledge whatsoever that Gawker was about to launch a sex tape about him. No one ever bothered to call Mr. Bollea, such as Gawker, to say, Mr. Bollea, we're about to launch a sex tape. Do you have any comment? Was this secretly, or anything like that. Gawker just posted it.

So while Mr. Bollea was in the middle of a media tour for a Pay-per-view event, the news about a sex tape came out. And, obviously, he did not have a media tour to promote the sex tape. I think that's, if I'm reading it correctly, what Mr. Berlin is suggesting, and that's just simply not the case.

Now, as far as the documents relating to the media tour, Elizabeth Traub didn't work on that media tour. And I have talked to Mr. Berlin about this, and I have said, Elizabeth Traub doesn't have any documents at all about that media tour. And I have checked and double checked and triple

checked, and that's the case because she didn't work on it. So they're seeking to compel things that she doesn't have. And they brought -- they brought a petition in New York state court to have her produce things that she doesn't have and also to get into privileged communications. And, unfortunately, the New York court has to deal with that.

As far as documents that may be in Mr. Bollea's possession, I have checked with him. I haven't gotten anything. He's still checking to see if he has, for example, a list of his media appearances. These media appearances took place 16 months ago, possibly a little bit longer than that. So these things were scheduled 16 to 17 months ago. Mr. Bollea is not the type of person who gets a document and keeps it. He's the type of person who gets the document, does a media tour, and then probably throws out the media tour lists soon after he does the media tour. And, again, this is a media tour for a wrestling event; it was not for the sex tape.

So in terms of what's the relevant scope of documents, are we supposed to produce his plane ticket? Are we supposed to produce his itinerary

of where he flew and when, of when he showed up to which building and which address and who he was speaking to? I don't know if he has any of that.

But then there is the other question of, Is that really relevant? Is it relevant which airline he flew on or which date he took a flight, whether it was a 6:00 a.m. flight or a 10:00 a.m. flight.

I would like to get some sense of whether he's required to find that, because maybe he would be able to find an old plane itinerary as opposed to a media itinerary which could have been done by a different person. I don't know.

But it's not that we're withholding anything, because the relevant stuff is we all acknowledge that he did talk with the press while he was on this media tour for the wrestling event. And Gawker seems to have found every single occasion where he talked to a reporter, because when he talked to somebody, there is an article about it, a YouTube or wherever it happens to be. If he was on the Today Show, then there is probably a tape of some sort.

We don't have any of the tapes. For the press clipping files, he doesn't keep one. His

publicist doesn't keep one. His publicist didn't work on this particular event, in any event, so she wouldn't have one even if they did keep press clipping files on things she worked on, because she didn't work on this one.

But from someone from Mr. Bollea's point of view, there is so much media out there that -- and it's all available at any time. You go to Google and you type in "Terry Bollea Today Show 2012," you'll get probably a whole bunch of articles about how he was on the Today Show. It's not just from the "today.com" or the "nbctoday.com"; it's from all kinds of folks, because everyone likes to report on what other people reported on. And so you just get this huge explosion of media reports.

I'm not sure that the things that Gawker is seeking are relevant. I talked to Seth after he filed the motion, and we had a meet-and-confer conference after the fact. And I said if we have any list of the media people that he spoke to, I'm happy to get that to you. Elizabeth Traub doesn't have it, and Mr. Bollea has not been able to find it. And, Your Honor, if he can find it, I'm happy to give that over to them. But it's not the type of thing that he keeps, and if he -- it may not be

1 in his possession, so --2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. HARDER: And as far as sanctions, 4 obviously, we oppose sanctions. I don't want 5 anyone saying I don't oppose sanctions. I just 6 don't feel that anything is sanctionable here. 7 don't think that we did anything wrong, and I 8 don't think that the motion was necessary. And 9 Mr. Berlin could have given me a call after he 10 sent his meet-and-confer letter and says, Let's 11 talk, and, What are you willing to give? 12 would have had this conversation with him and the 13 things that I am willing to do, such as look 14 through the phone records for the relevant phone 1.5 calls as opposed to giving over all of the phone 16 calls of 2012. I would have been happy to do 17 that. 1.8 And as far as -- and the schedule of 19 reporters that he spoke to, I told Mr. Berlin I'm 20 happy to give it to him when we find it, but the 21 publicist doesn't have it and he doesn't have it. 22 So that's kind of where we are. Thank you. 23 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Berlin? 24 MR. BERLIN: Your Honor, just to be helpful, 25 let me try and go through the order that

Mr. Harder used, even though it wasn't the order that was in our motion or the order that was used originally.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERLIN: The phone records, I think that there is sort of two issues.

One is we served an interrogatory that has to do with communications. And if he can use documents that are within his possession, custody, or control to answer that question, he ought to be asked to do so and not just say, you know, Here are two sets that describe all of the communications that I had in a two-month period with Bubba Clem, which is what the current interrogatory does.

As far as the records themselves, certainly, calls with Bubba Clem and Heather Clem are certainly relevant. Calls with, whether it's Ms. Traub or if he has another publicist, since it seems like from the publicity tour that he's saying Ms. Traub didn't assist him in doing that, then presumably someone else did. Those calls would be relevant, certainly. Calls with people with media organizations, directly would be relevant.

1 2 H
3 t
4 a
5 r
6 M
7 b
8 t
9 f
10 r

Honor -- and this is why we said we're not going to start calling people but that we wanted to be able to obtain these records -- is, you know, I'm reluctant to say, Well, let me just have

Mr. Harder decide what's relevant or not relevant, because he doesn't -- he has a different theory of the case. He has, in many briefs that we have filed back and forth, a different view of what's relevant, you know. The briefs and these two motions, he says, Here is what's relevant to this case. And it's a fairly narrow description, and it excludes the primary thing that we're trying to do, which is to be able to test what the plaintiff is saying in these various factual contentions.

And the problem that I want to avoid, Your

So we think the appropriate thing is to be able to review them. They, obviously, can be produced pursuant to the confidentiality in this case. And although Mr. Harder has alluded in both his papers and earlier in this session, that Gawker is a media company that publishes things, we have not published anything that we have received in discovery, whether it was designated as confidential or otherwise, and have scrupulously honored the confidentiality order and

would -- and would continue to do so.

But trying to have him guess what we think would be important is a bad idea in discovery, and that's not how it's supposed to work. And I think also that you are -- your particular suggestion was maybe that I ought to have the record at his deposition so we can -- that one can ask him those questions and is particularly important so we can -- we can go through and ask them.

We would hope to do it and have the records a little bit in advance so that we're not sitting there going line by line saying, Whose number is this? Whose number is this? Because he's not likely to know that off the top of his head, although some of them presumably, but a good number of them he may not. So there has got to be some way of getting that information.

On the FBI records, Your Honor, this is a fairly narrow request. It's not -- the last time we were here saying, Can we have a FOIA, the privacy act, FBI authorization for the FBI's files subject to whatever objections they might make? It was calling for their whole file. Here it's to the -- limited to the subject of either his or his counsel's communications with them.

And, you know, again, this goes back to the subject of -- we didn't really address it in the last motion in detail, but, you know, we've gotten fairly strident e-mails from Mr. Harder saying that, first, the deposition was cancelled but then was back on, but you couldn't re-call the witness, and so forth.

And, you know, we had proposed that, you know -- we've deferred the depositions by something like 90 days and allow Judge Campbell to rule on the objections to Your Honor's reported recommendation that have already been filed and any others that might get filed at that hearing in April. And that was something that, ultimately, Mr. Harder steadfastly opposed. So, obviously, we are prepared to go forward.

But, you know, if this is something where if we are able to obtain more records, either directly from the plaintiff or the FBI, we would, in fact, want to be able to re-call the plaintiff and ask him about it, which we'll be penalized for, you know, having to go through this process, having offered to slow the thing down so that we can do this once after Judge Campbell has an opportunity to review the exceptions and then

having the plaintiff refute. That just doesn't seem right to us.

With respect to the media appearances, we literally have not a single record related to the -- to the media tour, which, my understanding, it started, actually, after the Gawker story was published and it ended before this lawsuit was filed. There is about an 11-day period. And the -- we have no information from the plaintiff. And I don't know who did that, if Ms. Traub didn't do it. We understood her to the publicist. And that's why we sent her a subpoena, which she has, in fact, provided all the information related to the publicity efforts in connection with this lawsuit, that post dated the filing of the lawsuit, but there was nothing that predated it.

And I don't where those documents are, but I don't think I'm that naive to think that a celebrity like Hulk Hogan goes on a major tour of all these major media outlets and there is no — there is literally no documentary evidence of it anywhere, let alone — you know, there is also an interrogatory response, you know, that could be — at least go to — that we talked about already.

So I don't know where that comes from. But

these are -- you know, if you have -- if you have exchanges with your publicist or if you have exchanges with, if not Ms. Traub, with someone else that is handling that for you, or if nobody is handling it for you and you're doing it directly -- and certainly, you know, it may be the case that the plaintiff would not normally keep records of this for, you know, a year and a half if nothing else were going on.

But, in fact, within days of completing that media tour, he filed this lawsuit and a companion case in federal court against Gawker that was then replaced with Gawker being brought into this case a couple months later. And, you know, he would have some obligation to retain those things even if he wouldn't otherwise do so in a vacuum.

And so it is rather troubling that having served discovery in December and then we have depositions starting one week from today and we still have the plaintiff checking to see what he has. And -- but it is also concerning. And, look, I am more interested in substantive communication that he had media outlets and more with his publicist about his media strategy, but I'm also interested in understanding what he was

doing in this period, because I don't -- you know, we know what we can find, but we don't know what we can't find, and that's the whole point of discovery.

So, you know, that's why we have also asked for some of the logistical documents so that we understand what was going on. So this is not something -- I will say I don't like to go down this road, but, you know, Ms. Smith was on the call with me with Mr. Harder. We were supposed to have the subject taken up on Friday, the 14th. It was our effort to do it together over the weekend, and Mr. Harder made himself -- he was not available until the afternoon of Tuesday, the 18th.

This was done at his request after we had sent our letter and after we had filed our motion. And during that call, Mr. Harder didn't even want to have a substantive conversation about the discovery. He was frustrated with me on another subject and wanted to hang up the phone. And I had to encourage him and say, Look, you know, I think -- you have asked for this. We should at least try to talk about this.

But this is not what we talked about, you

1.5

know, should we need to file a motion, you know.

You ought to be able to, you know, serve what is
in our six discovery requests and not have to come
back with literally no substantive information for
five of them after a two-week extension.

And look, I'm happy to give you an extension, but I don't want the fact that I gave you an extension to be used against me, you know, to sort of jam me with the upcoming depositions. And then that is exactly where we are. That just doesn't seem right to me.

We would respectfully request that the discovery on these three topics be ordered as requested -- or recommended to be ordered as requested, I guess is the proper way to put it.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. HARDER: Yeah, Judge. Just a couple of minutes.

As far as the communications relating to media, these are not things that were requested a long, long time ago. These were things that were requested in December. Seth and I have a kind of a regular thing where, if we need a little bit more time, we give each other a little bit more time. He often asks for 30 days, and I -- or 15

to 30 days, and I routinely give them. I asked for, I think, 15 days on the media things, and he gave me the additional time. That put things into, I think, either late January or early February.

Ever since then, Mr. Bollea has been looking to see if he has any communications relating to the media appearances. And I have checked in with him periodically, and I haven't gotten anything. I don't think he has them. I don't necessarily think that he's given up, but by this week, I'm sure that I'm going to get to the bottom of it, whether he has any of these things or not.

We are not intentionally withholding anything. All that we're talking about here are things like his schedule for the media promotional tour back in October that related to a wrestling event. That's what we're talking about. It's not like we're talking about the smoking gun of the case. We're talking about a promotional media tour and a list of appearances.

I'm not withholding information from

Mr. Berlin about that media tour. Typically, what
happens -- and I assume it's the case here -- that
when a production company does a production, very

1.5

1.8

often the production company will have somebody who handles the media tour. It could be in-house in their media department or marketing, or whatever they call it, or it could be an outside publicist. I don't know who the person was who was involved.

That information was actually never requested in any of this discovery, but I don't know who the person was. And I don't know what Mr. Bollea is going to remember 16 months back: Oh, I think it was James Smith. It would surprise me.

But it would have been the production company that would know all this information because they were the one who handled the scheduling of the media appearances for the Pay-per-view wrestling event. It's not something that we're trying to keep from him. We just don't have it. And I feel like we just keep getting pounded and pounded and pounded on things that we just don't have.

As far as -- I don't even want to mention it, but as far as the characterization of the Valentine's Day conference that Seth and I had, Seth was the one who sent me an e-mail saying, Let's talk about the things that we filed a motion over, and I said okay.

We get on the phone on Valentine's Day to talk about that, and Seth wants to talk about procedural issues rather than substantive issues, and so we talked about procedural issues for 90 minutes. And he had a laundry list of things that he wanted, including I wasn't allowed to file a motion to compel; I had to agree to not have

discovery take place during certain times.

We had to have this long drawn-out calendar where we would not have a trial date probably until early 2015, if even then. And, ultimately, we could not come to an agreement on this long laundry list of things. And if it had been as simple as, Let's postpone the depositions for a month, or so, so that we can try to get to the bottom of these discovery issues, that would have been easy.

It's kind of too late now, because everybody on my side is completely locked into these depositions. People have bought their tickets, and they are probably nonrefundable at this point. They have reserved their hotels, and Mr. Bollea has carved out next week for depositions. And it would be very difficult to uproot his schedule and try to go find dates where he and Ms. Clem and

Bubba Clem are all available in the exact order that Gawker wants to take them in, because right now they're scheduled for the exact order. And a problem that we had back in November was that we had everybody together, available for deposition. But the ordering was slightly off and Gawker said, No, we want this order. It has to be this. So since we have everyone locked in, our point of view is, Let's just get them done.

1.5

1.8

As far as this issue of Gawker is a media organization that publishes information about people, as far as I know, I think that Seth is correct, that Gawker hasn't published anything about Hulk Hogan relating to this case except for when Judge Campbell issued her order enjoining the sex tape. Gawker completely went off on Judge Campbell when she issued that order. And, otherwise, I think it's been quiet for the time being.

But that's not to say that Gawker isn't readying itself for some expose, either on a one-time basis or on a long-term basis, of several installments of talking about Mr. Bollea, and this is the story of the sex tape lawsuit, and these are all the things that we found out, and this,

that, and the other thing. And as far as I know, there would be no way to stop them from that other than to enforce the protective order, but that's not the ideal situation.

So because of this, we have asked

Judge Campbell to help us to be very careful about
the types of information that Gawker can get into
and how that information can be treated.

And she's been very receptive, and I'm sure Your Honor would be receptive as well, but I just wanted to give some context to those issues.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HARDER: That's all I have.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right.

MR. BERLIN: Your Honor, if I can just -- I must just -- there is a couple things that
Mr. Harder stated that are just not right.

We mentioned this in our papers, but I just wanted to give the Court the flavor of this. The notion that this -- about media appearances and public statements is a new discovery request is not right. We mentioned this in our paper.

Putting aside the general request that have to do with documents in any manner related to the video and communications you had about the video

or the Gawker story -- which, obviously, that whole media tour covers because he spoke about it in every one of them -- those are requests that date back to last June. But we also have requests like request No. 25: Any and all documents concerning any public statements made by you about the video, any and all documents concerning any public statements made by you about the Gawker story.

I mean, these are the things that we asked for, you know, prior. As we said, you know, there was an objection that, you know, he doesn't have a publicist who takes care of the actual statements themselves, so we came back and we just wanted the communication that led those. We'll go and find them on our own. And we can't get them.

And so the notion that we start this process in June and we're still -- now it's the second request and, you know, followed by an extension, followed by a letter, followed by no response, followed by a phone call belatedly saying, you know, Can we talk about this, which started with a, "I don't even want to talk about this."

I mean, this is not the way discovery is supposed to work. And I respectfully request that

the Court recognize and Your Honor recognize this is not -- that these things are basically being withheld or being told, We're following up, and, you know, he's still checking. And, you know, we are, at Mr. Harder's insistence, you know, a week away from deposition. So I don't believe, as I said earlier, that discovery needs to be an emergency. But if you sit on your hands for months and months, then you sort of have no choice but to ask that it be done, you know, in an expedited fashion so that you get the things you need and move on.

We would have been happy to put this off, and I think we had agreed that we would do that by that, you know, by 90 days, which would allow Judge Campbell a reasonable amount of time to hear this in late April and to issue an order thereafter and to get any discovery that she ordered exchanged.

Having refused to do that and having indicated that they were -- at least part of whatever ruling, if Your Honor would be inclined to agree with us on today's FBI ruling and certainly last week's FBI ruling, and maybe other rulings, there may be other things that we don't

have. And all we're asking for in that regard is the ability to say, Okay, if that's what happened, then we need to be able to reserve our right to call a witness, because it's not fair to us otherwise.

I otherwise will stand on what I had said previously about the phone records and the FBI records and, you know, on the media appearances. We don't have anything that I would like to add.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HARDER: Judge Case, like 20 seconds about the issue of other discovery that's not part of the motion to compel.

When they asked us for documents that pertained to public statements that are made by Mr. Bollea, we produced information and documents that were responsive. I had no idea that when they asked for documents regarding public statements, that they were asking for a travel itinerary. I mean, that was -- it's so far removed from the discovery of last year. And they never moved to compel on that old discovery, because we produced and were responsive to what they had asked for.

So the new stuff is the stuff that pertains

1.5

to -- and I don't know if it mentions travel itineraries or not -- but just for the meet-and-confer process and by reading their motions, I have gleaned that that is what they are after. So that's what we're talking about.

1.5

I just -- I just need to clarify that when they characterize this as we're all stonewalling them, it's just not the case. We're giving them what they asked for. We don't have a whole lot. They are also not clear about it or they are giving us discovery that says one thing but they mean another, and then in the motion they clarify what it is they meant.

We're doing our best here. There really isn't a need for motion upon motion on so much of this discovery. And in terms of the meet-and-confer conference that Mr. Berlin and I had, he says that I was refusing to talk about the substance. We did talk -- actually, the first conversation was on Valentine's Day. And Mr. Berlin didn't want to talk about the substance; he wanted to talk about the procedure.

And then the next conversation that we had was after the three-day holiday. My office was closed on Monday. Most offices were closed on

Monday. We had a conference on Tuesday. And we did have a substantive conversation on every single point that's in both of these motions and also the New York petition. And Mr. Berlin would not compromise on a single point, nothing, nada. He would not compromise on anything. And I covered every single issue.

1.5

So, unfortunately, there is this two ways of looking at it. I just wanted to clarify it because he was bringing it up. Thank you.

MR. BERLIN: Your Honor, I will just say for the record I disagree with that characterization wholly, but I don't think any good purpose would be served in enumerating why. So I just want to memorialize on the record that I disagree with that — the characterization both of our earlier discovery: Mr. Harder's statements about it at the prior hearing about our earlier discovery and about our meet—and—confer conversations. And I will leave it at that, but I just wanted to memorialize that on the record.

THE COURT: Thank you. With respect to the fifth motion to compel discovery on an expedited basis, I think that Gawker has made their case. They have demonstrated the need for this. And I

1 am going to order that $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$ I will recommend that 2 the Court order that the relief that is sought in 3 the motion be granted as to all three areas: 4 publicist, the FBI, and the cell phone records. 5 And I'm going to recommend that all of these 6 records be furnished to Gawker no later than 4:00 7 p.m. this Thursday, the 27th of February, to help 8 them prepare for these depositions that are coming 9 up starting next week. 10 MR. BERLIN: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 MR. BERLIN: We did this the last time, and 13 we would be happy to do it again. Would you like 14 us to prepare reports of your recommendations on 1.5 the two motions? 16 THE COURT: That would be greatly 17 appreciated. 1.8 MR. BERLIN: All right. We will do that. 19 And we will send them to Mr. Harder for his -- and 20 Mr. Turkel -- for their approval as to form. 21 we'll try and get those to you -- we will try to 22 get those to you shortly. 23 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 24 (Hearing concluded at 3:27 p.m.) 25

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH
5	
6	
7	I, Aaron T. Perkins, Registered Professional Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the above excerpted
8	hearing proceedings and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.
9	
10	
11	I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	Dated this 25th day of February, 2014.
17	
18	
19	
20	HOIC &
21	1 0+
22	Aaron T. Perkins, RPR
23	
24	
25	