## **EXHIBIT A**

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.

HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAMELA A.M. CAMPBELL

DATE: July 1, 2015

TIME: 1:36 p.m. to 5:10 p.m.

PLACE: Pinellas County Courthouse

545 1st Avenue North

Third Floor

St. Petersburg, Florida

REPORTED BY: Aaron T. Perkins, RPR

Notary Public, State of

Florida at Large

Volume 2

Pages 123 to 301

```
1
    APPEARANCES:
2
       CHARLES J. HARDER, ESQUIRE
3
       JENNIFER J. McGRATH, ESQUIRE
       Harder, Mirell & Abrams, LLP
4
       1925 Century Park East
       Suite 800
5
       Los Angeles, California 90067
6
               and -
7
       KENNETH G. TURKEL, ESQUIRE
       SHANE B. VOGT, ESQUIRE
8
       Bajo Cuva Cohen & Turkel, P.A.
       100 North Tampa Street
9
       Suite 1900
       Tampa, Florida 33602
10
            - and -
11
       DAVID R. HOUSTON, ESQUIRE
12
       The Law Office of David R. Houston
       432 Court Street
13
       Reno, Nevada 89501
14
15
            Attorneys for Plaintiff
16
17
18
19
     APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
    APPEARANCES CONTINUED AS FOLLOWS:
2
3
       SETH D. BERLIN, ESQUIRE
       MICHAEL D. SULLIVAN, ESQUIRE
4
       Levine Sullivan Koch & Schulz, LLP
       1899 L Street, N.W.
5
       Suite 200
       Washington, D.C. 20036
6
              and -
7
       MICHAEL BERRY, ESQUIRE
8
       PAUL J. SAFIER, ESQUIRE
       Levine Sullivan Koch & Schulz, LLP
       1760 Market Street
       Suite 1001
10
       Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
11
               and -
12
       RACHEL FUGATE, ESQUIRE
       Thomas & LoCicero, P.L.
13
       601 South Boulevard
       Tampa, Florida 33606
14
            Attorneys for Defendant Gawker Media, LLC,
15
            et al.
16
17
    ALSO PRESENT:
18
       Heather L. Dietrick,
19
            President and General Counsel for The Gawker
            Media Group
20
       Alison Steele, Esquire (for Media Outlets)
            Rahdert, Steele Reynolds & Driscoll, P.L.
21
            535 Central Avenue
            St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
22
23
24
25
```

1 ahead of it, so then you're going to argue, Well, 2 let's see the whole thing --3 MR. HARDER: That's fine. 4 THE COURT: -- or do whatever. So we'll have 5 all that worked out ahead of time. 6 MR. HARDER: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: So if there is specific 8 objections, Mr. Harder, because you think there 9 are too many, then you will speak up --10 MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you. THE COURT: -- and I will at that point rule. 11 12 So I think that No. 10, then, is Okay. 13 generally denied in part and granted in part. 14 not really sure how you actually call it, but a 1.5 limited amount. 16 Let's go to No. 11, which is plaintiff's 17 motion in limine to exclude irrelevant and 1.8 inadmissible Bubba Clem radio broadcast 19 disparaging the plaintiff and his family. 20 I think, specifically go to the time that was after the lawsuit was filed, and apparently 21 22 Mr. Clem is upset because he got sued. 23 MR. VOGT: Yes, Your Honor. I think, quite 24 frankly, that one is going to have to be deferred 25 in connection with your ruling on settlement.

MR. BERRY: I mean, I'm prepared to argue it.

There are some things related to the settlement
that may fold into the back end of it. But the
reason why it's relevant is clear without that.

But I prefer to deal with it on the front end,
because if we need to talk about some of the
settlement stuff, I will just refer to our papers
on the settlement. But having some guidance on
what we can do with these shows, I think, is
critical for both sides. I don't really know that
it has a whole lot to do with the settlement.

THE COURT: I would be inclined to agree it's not even relevant. There are many, many rabbit trails that this trial can go down. This could potentially be one of them. In some regards, I almost feel as though I will need to reserve on it to hear what all the rest of Mr. Clem's testimony is going to be.

For example, if he comes in and says, No, we're great buddies; we have made up, you know, something in that regard, clearly at some point then that may open the door to some of this other --

MR. VOGT: Judge, if the settlement comes in, it may become relevant to us. That why I'm saying

we would prefer the Court to rule on it, because
we may want some of this to come if evidence of
the settlement comes in.

MR. BERRY: Your Honor, may I just explain why from the outset it's just relevant, period, with respect to the settlement?

Basically, on October 15th, plaintiff filed suit against Gawker, filed suit against Bubba Clem, and filed against Heather Clem. Prior to that time, Mr. Clem and the plaintiff had been exchanging text messages back and forth. And on the 16th and 17th, Mr. Clem went on the radio and, for numerous hours both days, he devoted his program to rebutting Mr. Bollea's public statements that he had been making about the nature of his videotape.

First, Mr. Clem said that plaintiff pursued Heather. Second, he said that Mr. Bollea knew of the taping. Third, he suggested Mr. Bollea may have released the tape. He talked about -- it's unclear from their motion exactly what they're trying to exclude from this footage. But he talked about what he called the typical Hulk Hogan MO. And he went on to give a series of examples from Mr. Bollea's life about how this context of

how Mr. Bollea was lying to the public about this was just like a series of other incidents.

And he goes through them, and he proves it point by point by talking about other things that he has knowledge of based on what Mr. Bollea had told him. Again, it's not clear to me what it is they want to exclude. But most of these shows dealt with it. All of this evidence is relevant because what you will hear when Mr. Clem gets up is that, Well, it wasn't true that plaintiff pursued Ms. Clem. It wasn't true that he knew about the taping. It wasn't true that he might have released it.

And we are allowed to use those -- what he said at that time as impeachment as prior inconsistent statements. This is classic credibility questions. He's made numerous statements that are going to contradict what his testimony was.

And the fact that he now says that none of this is true, we believe, may be a lie, and we're allowed to show that. And we're allowed to show it even with respect to statements that don't deal with this taping, because those statements were true as established through other evidence in the

1 case that Mr. Clem -- that we can't get into for 2 confidentiality reasons. 3 And the jury should be able to decide whether 4 Mr. Clem is going to be sitting in the chair lying 5 to them then or whether he was lying to his radio 6 audience on October 16th and 17th. And they're 7 the ones that will make that decision. 8 THE COURT: Here is the thing: I think what 9 you're trying to get at, though, is whether or not 10 Mr. Bollea is telling the truth about whether he 11 knew or didn't know that he was being recorded, 12 right, not Mr. Clem? 13 MR. BERRY: Right. If I misspoke -- but what 14 Mr. Clem said is that Mr. Bollea first pursued 1.5 Ms. Clem, then Mr. Bollea knew about the taping, 16 and that Mr. Bollea might have released the tape. 17 He said all those things on the radio. And when 18 he gets up on the witness stand --19 THE COURT: Okay. Let's take that one at a 20 Mr. Clem is saying all that, right? 21 MR. BERRY: Correct. 22 THE COURT: That Mr. Bollea knew about the 23 taping, and what was the second one? 24 MR. BERRY: That he pursued Ms. Clem, that he

knew about the taping, and that he might have

released it. And what you will hear when he testifies, I believe, is the opposite, that he and Ms. Clem pursued the plaintiff, that Mr. Bollea didn't know about the taping, and that he thinks now that Mr. Bollea did not release it. We're allowed to impeach him with his prior inconsistent statements. And beyond that --

THE COURT: Impeach Mr. Clem?

1.5

1.8

MR. BERRY: Correct. And we're allowed to -and when he says, Everything I said on that show
was a lie, which is what they have said in their
motion, we're allowed to impeach him on that too,
because we have evidence that it was not. And the
jury can ultimately determine whether Mr. Clem,
who is one of the three participants in this, was
lying on the show, is lying to them now, is lying
in his deposition, was lying when he and
Mr. Bollea were communicating about this before he
was sued.

THE COURT: Isn't the critical part Mr. Bollea?

MR. BERRY: It is. But he's one of three -Mr. Clem is one of three people who knows the
truth. The only reason they want to call Mr. Clem
is to say that Mr. Bollea was taped without his

knowledge and that, as far as he knows, Mr. Bollea had nothing to do with the release of the tape. I suspect that that's what they're going to ask him. That's what he's going to come in here and testify about.

We should be able to cross-examine him fully with the hours and hours — and we won't go on for hours and hours. But he went on for hours and hours and hours saying again and again and again, Mr. Bollea pursued Ms. Clem; Mr. Bollea knew about the taping; he might have been the one to release it; this is the Hulk Hogan MO. And goes through a series of examples. And whether he walks away from those things now or not, we're allowed to cross-examine him, because it's the core credibility one of three percipient witnesses or fact witnesses.

THE COURT: He's not an expert?

MR. BERRY: He's an expert in some things,

but not in --

1.5

1.8

MR. VOGT: May I respond, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. VOGT: Mr. Berry said several times he believes or he suspects. There is nothing to believe or suspect. Mr. Clem has been deposed.

Under oath at his deposition he said, I lied on the radio; I lied on the radio because I was in cover my (Indicating) mode.

THE COURT: So why would you call him as a witness?

MR. VOGT: Because he's going to testify, as he did in his deposition, that the truth was that Mr. Bollea had no idea he was being taped and I did it without his knowledge.

THE COURT: But if he's going to testify to those things, they have the opportunity to impeach him on it.

MR. VOGT: I don't disagree with that necessarily, Your Honor. This motion relates to a few other things. But I want the record to be clear about this. Heather Clem has also been deposed and testified that he had no idea that he was being taped. So it's not like guessing or speculation. I mean, they have the evidence on this. They know it's going to take place.

But the reason why I think that it's important that this motion be addressed in connection with the settlement argument on the motion in limine is the fact that this motion in particular goes to more than just that one

1.5

particular discussion on the radio. There are other attacks that Mr. Clem was making on Mr. Bollea's family.

THE COURT: Well, I think -- you will have to just wait, though, and see who opens what door when he's testifying.

MR. VOGT: Right. And that's what I was saying. We should defer this, because it becomes much more relevant to our case. Quite frankly, if the settlement agreement does come in, this evidence can help explain that.

MR. BERRY: Just to be clear --

MR. VOGT: This was a consideration. When a man's family is being destroyed on the radio by Bubba Clem, there can be some impacts on that.

MR. BERRY: Your Honor, two points, if I may. One with respect to the settlement, I'll refer to our papers, that there is every incentive for Mr. Clem to get up there and tell the story that he's going to based on that settlement agreement.

But, second, what I would say to you is if they don't call Mr. Clem, then we will. And the reason we're going to put him on the stand is to have him say the same things that he said on the radio. And if he doesn't say them, then we'll

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA
4	COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH
5	
6	I Asson T Dorking Dogistored Drofossional
7	I, Aaron T. Perkins, Registered Professional Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the above hearing and that
8	the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.
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 2nd day of July, 2015.
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Aaron T. Perkins, RPR
23	
25	
_ J	